

**Zoning Ordinance Approval**  
**CITY OF AUSTIN**  
**RECOMMENDATION FOR COUNCIL ACTION**



**AGENDA ITEM NO.: 74**  
**AGENDA DATE: Thu 12/15/2005**  
**PAGE: 1 of 1**

**SUBJECT:** C14-05-0025 - 1706 & 1708 West 6<sup>th</sup> Street - Approve third reading of an ordinance amending Chapter 25-2 of the Austin City Code by rezoning property locally known as 1706 & 1708 West 6<sup>th</sup> Street (Town Lake/Johnson Creek Watersheds) from family residence-neighborhood plan (SF-3-NP) combining district zoning to neighborhood office-mixed use-conditional overlay-neighborhood plan (NO-MU-CO-NP) combining district zoning. First reading approved on September 1, 2005. Vote: 7-0. Second reading approved on October 20, 2005. Vote: 7-0. Applicant: City of Austin. Agent: Neighborhood Planning and Zoning Department. City Staff: Jorge E. Rousselin, 974-2975. Note: A valid petition has been filed in opposition to this rezoning request.

**REQUESTING** Neighborhood Planning **DIRECTOR'S**  
**DEPARTMENT:** and Zoning **AUTHORIZATION:** Greg Guernsey

---

## THIRD READING SUMMARY SHEET

**ZONING CASE NUMBER: C14-05-0025**

**REQUEST:**

**C14-05-0025 - 1706 & 1708 W. 6th Street - Old West Austin Neighborhood Plan rezoning - Conduct a public hearing and approve an ordinance amending Chapter 25-2 of the Austin City Code by rezoning property locally known as 1706 & 1708 W. 6th Street (Town Lake Watershed) from family residence-neighborhood plan (SF-3-NP) combining district zoning to neighborhood office-mixed use-conditional overlay-neighborhood plan (NO-MU-CO-NP) combining district zoning. Planning Commission Recommendation: To grant neighborhood office-mixed use-conditional overlay-neighborhood plan (NO-MU-CO-NP) combining district zoning. Property Owners: 1706-Sara & Jeffrey Leon; 1708-Don Henry. Applicant: City of Austin. Agent: Neighborhood Planning and Zoning Department. City Staff: Jorge Rousselin, 974-2975. A valid petition has been filed in opposition to this rezoning request.**

**DEPARTMENT COMMENTS:**

**The Old West Austin Neighborhood Plan approved in April 2000, included provisions that allowed rezoning of the property on the north side of 6<sup>th</sup> Street, from single family to neighborhood office. The plan states under Goal 3 – Land Use Policies: In the North 6<sup>th</sup> Street District (lots along the north side of 6<sup>th</sup> Street): No zoning to a more permissive category. Exceptions: If zoned SF-3, allow rezoning to NO-MU-CO where the CO is: fewer than 40 trips/day business access through alley is prohibited (though residential access is acceptable), business access through a street with a minimum width of 36' is required, and there shall be a 10' vegetative buffer or a 6' masonry fence that separates the business use (including parking) and adjacent residential property. Owner occupied structures are encouraged. The properties are currently used for offices. The trip limits indicated in the neighborhood plan recommendation would not allow the current structures to be used for offices. The existing floor areas in each house are greater than those that would allow a 40-trip per day limit for each property. The City of Austin Public Works Department and Transportation Reviewers have indicated a preference for alley access due to safety concerns with constructing a driveway onto W. 6<sup>th</sup> St. in this area in the attached memorandum (Exhibit A). There is support for the rezoning by commercial neighbors and for alley access. However, residential neighbors would want alley access to be prohibited.**

**A petition has been filed representing a little over 34% of the land area within 200 feet of the subject tracts.**

**On September 1, 2005 the City Council passed on 1<sup>st</sup> reading a rezoning of 1706-1708 W Sixth St. from SF-3-NP to NO-MU-NP with 8 conditions. Two of those conditions, limiting access to Sixth St. and a 145 vehicle trip per day limit will be a conditional overlay in the ordinance. Five of the conditions; a masonry fence, dumpster prohibition, submittal of a site plan, commencement of construction and a rollback provision will be in a private restrictive covenant.**

One of the conditions requested the staff to explore the possibility of permitting the property to be legal non-complying/non conforming. The staff requested that the applicant present a list of those code requirements from which they were seeking exemption. Exemptions to the site development regulations would include the following:

1. Article 7: Section 25-6-471, Section 25-6-472 and the Transportation Criteria Manual: No paving/technical design with the exception of paving the driveway entrance and drive aisle.
2. Chapter 25-7: Drainage: No on-site detention required.
3. Article 6: Section 25-8-211 and Section 25-8-214: No water quality controls required.
4. Article 10: Section 25-2-1051 and Section 25-2-1066 and The Environmental Criteria Manual Section 2: Landscaping/Buffering not required except the masonry wall as required by the Neighborhood Plan, as amended.
5. Building Criteria Manual: Section 1, Section 4 and Section 5: To require no utility upgrades to commercial standards
6. Article 2: Section 25-2-492: To exceed the overall impervious cover and building coverage under NO base zoning district (objective is current improvements and related parking/driveway are ok)
7. Uniform Building Code: To not comply with major ADA or TAS renovations:
  - a) Except for 20% of the total cost of the overall remodel
  - b) Those areas on the first floor utilized for customer service and waiting

Staff had a meeting with the applicant's agent and items 4-7 were withdrawn. Staff cannot support the exemptions from these requirements. Staff is also unaware of a legal means to make exemptions from these Code requirements through the zoning process.

#### Item 1. Paved Parking

Since at least 1973, the City Code has required that commercial parking lots be paved with a hard surfacing material sufficient to prevent mud, dust, loose material, and other nuisances. The use of gravel or similar materials is not generally permitted because:

- Gravel cannot be striped; consequently, there is no way to delineate parking spaces.
- For drainage purposes, gravel is not considered pervious when used in parking lots because it eventually becomes compacted.
- Gravel is not an effective filtration device for water quality purposes unless it is periodically removed and replaced.
- Gravel may be a hazard for pedestrians and does not meet requirements for handicapped accessibility.
- Gravel can be carried into city streets and drainageways by automobiles or stormwater. Loose gravel on asphalt streets can be imbedded into the surface by vehicles, leading to pavement deterioration and potholes.
- Gravel produces dust in dry weather, and mud or standing water in wet weather.

Section 25-6-472 (H) of the Land Development Code requires parking areas comply with the Transportation Criteria Manual. There is not a variance procedure for this section of the Code. The Transportation Criteria Manual does allow the Director to approve crushed stone for parking

in order to protect trees. In such cases the stone must be limited to the critical root zone of the trees and must be confined by curbing or other barriers to keep it in place. Crushed stone is not allowed on slopes, within handicapped parking spaces, or along accessible routes between parking and the building entry.

Staff recommends that Council not waive the requirement for paved parking but rather allow the applicant to pursue the use of an alternative surface based on the criteria in the Transportation Criteria Manual. If Council does choose to waive the requirement, however, the waiver should not apply to handicapped-accessible parking.

Based upon the floor area of the buildings on this site, the owner would be required to provide 12 regular spaces and 1 accessible space, which will require about 4000 square feet of paving, in addition to the driveway to W. 6th St... It is unclear whether the applicant is asking for a waiver from the parking requirement or only the paving requirement. A variance from the parking requirement can only be granted by the Board of Adjustment unless a special ordinance is adopted for this property by City Council.

**Item 2. Chapter 25-7 Drainage:**

Impacts from new impervious cover will increase the run-off for the two, ten, twenty-five and one hundred year storms. Code requires on site detention for such development. Though the impact may be small for small amounts of impervious cover, it is the cumulative effect of many such projects that can be detrimental to our watersheds. However, if the applicant can demonstrate that a development's increase in run-off does not seriously impact any existing infrastructure then the applicant would be eligible to apply for a waiver to on-site detention. This process is in place in order to control, and offer relief from Code requirements, for just this type of project.

**Item 3. Article 6: Section 25-8-211 and Section 25-8-214 Water Quality**

On-site controls are required for cumulative increases of 5000 sq. ft or more, over base impervious cover, in the Urban watersheds. With certain developments, the applicant may be granted participation in "payment in lieu" of onsite water quality controls. This program allows difficult to treat, low impact developments to forego onsite treatment and compensate by contributing funds towards regional controls developed by the City. These mechanisms are in place to offer relief from Code for this type of development. Not requiring compliance would leave the regional program short funded.

The second reading of the ordinance for neighborhood office-mixed use-conditional overlay-neighborhood plan (NO-MU-CO-NP) combining district zoning was approved on October 20, 2005.

**OWNERS:** 1706-Sara & Jeffrey Leon; 1708-Don Henry

**AGENT:** City of Austin, Neighborhood Planning and Zoning Department

**DATE OF FIRST READING: September 1, 2005:**

The first reading of the ordinance for neighborhood office-mixed use-conditional overlay-neighborhood plan (NO-MU-CO-NP) combining district zoning with conditions was approved with the following conditions:

1. All vehicular access for non-residential uses will be limited to a driveway to 6th street.
2. The 145 trip limitation would be allocated as 68 trips for 1706 West 6th and 77 trips for 1708 West 6th.
3. A masonry fence will be constructed along the north property lines.
4. Commercial trash dumpsters are prohibited.
5. A site plan will be submitted within 90 days after the final approval of the zoning and approval of the site plan will be diligently pursued or the nonresidential use will cease.
6. Construction of the driveway and masonry fence will commence within 120 days of approval of the site plan by the City and be diligently pursued by the City or any non-residential use will cease.
7. Direct City staff to explore the possibility of permitting the property to be legal non-complying/non-conforming.
8. If a non-residential use ceases pursuant to the site plan or construction requirements in 5 or 6 above, the non-residential use will not resume until a site plan is approved and the driveway and masonry wall are complete.

**CITY COUNCIL HEARING DATE: December 1, 2005**

**CITY COUNCIL ACTION:**

**September 1, 2005:**

The first reading of the ordinance for neighborhood office-mixed use-conditional overlay-neighborhood plan (NO-MU-CO-NP) combining district zoning with conditions was approved with the following conditions.

1. All vehicular access for non-residential uses will be limited to a driveway to 6th street.
2. The 145 trip limitation would be allocated as 68 trips for 1706 West 6th and 77 trips for 1708 West 6th.
3. A masonry fence will be constructed along the north property lines.
4. Commercial trash dumpsters are prohibited.
5. A site plan will be submitted within 90 days after the final approval of the zoning and approval of the site plan will be diligently pursued or the nonresidential use will cease.
6. Construction of the driveway and masonry fence will commence within 120 days of approval of the site plan by the City and be diligently pursued by the City or any non-residential use will cease.

7. Direct City staff to explore the possibility of permitting the property to be legal non-complying/non-conforming.
8. If a non-residential use ceases pursuant to the site plan or construction requirements in 5 or 6 above, the non-residential use will not resume until a site plan is approved and the driveway and masonry wall are complete.

**October 20, 2005:**

The second reading of the ordinance for neighborhood office-mixed use-conditional overlay-neighborhood plan (NO-MU-CO-NP) combining district zoning was approved (consent). 7-0

**ORDINANCE NUMBER:**

**ASSIGNED STAFF:** Jorge E. Rousselin, e-mail: [jorge.rousselin@ci.austin.tx.us](mailto:jorge.rousselin@ci.austin.tx.us)

**ZONING CHANGE REVIEW SHEET**

**CASE:** C14-05-0025

**P.C. DATE:** April 26, 2005  
May 24, 2005

**ADDRESS:** 1706 & 1708 W. 6<sup>th</sup> Street

**OWNERS:** 1706 - Sara & Jeffrey Leon  
1708 - Don Henry

**APPLICANT/AGENT:** City of Austin, NPZD

**ZONING FROM:** SF-3-NP

**TO:** NO-MU-CO-NP  
(CITY INITIATED)

**AREA:**

**CITY COUNCIL 2<sup>nd</sup> READING APPROVAL OCTOBER 20, 2005:**

The second reading of the ordinance for neighborhood office-mixed use-conditional overlay-neighborhood plan (NO-MU-CO-NP) combining district zoning was approved (consent). 7-0

**PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION:**

May 24, 2005:

**MOTION:** APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATION, INCLUDING ALL CONDITIONS, BUT REQUIRE INGRESS AND EGRESS ONLY FROM THE ALLEY AND DIRECT STAFF TO PREPARE A PLAN TO ALLOW ON-STREET PARKING ON WEST 6<sup>TH</sup> STREET TO ADDRESS THE PARKING CONCERNS FOR SITE.

**VOTE:** (JR-1<sup>st</sup>, MM-2<sup>nd</sup>, CM-OPPOSED, CG- ABSENT)

**SUMMARY STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Recommend rezoning from family residence - neighborhood plan combining district (SF-3-NP) zoning to neighborhood office - mixed use- conditional overlay - neighborhood combining plan (NO-MU-CO-NP) zoning. The Conditional Overlay limits the two properties to 145 trips per day combined, allows ingress only from W. 6<sup>th</sup> Street, egress only to the alley to the north, a minimum 10 foot vegetative buffer or 6' masonry fence separating the parking area for business use except where egress is located.

**ISSUES:**

The Old West Austin Neighborhood Plan approved in April 2000, included provisions that allowed rezoning of the property on the north side of 6<sup>th</sup> Street, from single family to neighborhood office. The plan states under Goal 3 - Land Use Policies: In the North 6<sup>th</sup> Street District (lots along the north side of 6<sup>th</sup> Street): No zoning to a more permissive category. Exceptions: If zoned SF-3, allow rezoning to NO-MU-CO where the CO is: fewer than 40 trips/day business access through alley is prohibited (though residential access is acceptable), business access through a street with a minimum width of 36' is required, and there shall be a 10' vegetative buffer or a 6' masonry fence that separates the business use (including parking) and adjacent residential property. Owner occupied structures are

encouraged. The properties are currently used for offices. The trip limits indicated in the neighborhood plan recommendation would not allow the current structures to be used for offices. The existing floor areas in each house are greater than those that would allow a 40-tripper day limit for each property. The City of Austin Public Works Department and Transportation Reviewers have indicated a preference for alley access due to safety concerns with constructing a driveway onto W. 6<sup>th</sup> St. in this area in the attached memorandum (Exhibit A). There is support for the rezoning by commercial neighbors and for alley access. However, residential neighbors would want alley access to be prohibited.

A petition has been filed representing a little over 34% of the land area within 200 feet of the subject tracts.

#### DEPARTMENT COMMENTS:

The provisions of the Old West Neighborhood Plan provide conditions where the rezoning of the subject properties is recommended. Upon receipt of comments from other city departments, staff finds that the strict conditions for approval of support in the plan may be impractical or provide for a condition that may have safety issues. The existing structures were constructed as single-family dwellings that front on W. 6<sup>th</sup> Street near the entrance to Mopac. In this area and for most of the north side of W. 6<sup>th</sup> Street, conversion of single-family dwellings for office use has occurred. While staff supports the Old West Austin Neighborhood Plan as a whole, staff realizes that with each application and subsequent review of a request, may warrant some plan modification. In this case, the applicants are desirous of maintaining the structures, but allowing for commercial use. The intent of the neighborhood office-zoning district states a recommendation for conversion of the single-family structures for commercial use. With the existing structure square footage and office use designation resulting a calculated trip generation of 145 trips per day combined, placing a 40-vehicle trip limit for each structure would reduce the amount of floor area each tenant could use within the structures. The traffic impact of the total floor area would be mitigated somewhat by the ingress from W. 6<sup>th</sup> St. and egress to the alley only to be included in the Conditional Overlay. Prohibiting access to the alley creates a safety hazard with regard to exiting these properties onto W. 6<sup>th</sup> Street with very limited sight distance. Copies of the City Council transcripts requesting staff to initiate rezoning are attached. At their regular meeting on April 26, 2005 the Planning Commission voted to keep the Public Hearing open and to send this item to the Neighborhood Planning subcommittee to develop a recommendation to be presented to the Commission at the May 24<sup>th</sup>, 2005 Planning Commission meeting. The Planning Commission subcommittee directed staff to investigate options, which included on street parking along W. 6<sup>th</sup> St.; maintenance of alleyways, dedication of private property to the city of Austin for alleyway construction behind 1708 W. 6<sup>th</sup> St. The recommendation did not include any provisions for access from W. 6<sup>th</sup> Street to the properties. Staff indicated that these options would be presented to the appropriate departments for comments. A copy of determinations of the transportation related issues is attached. The relocation of the utility pole adjacent to the alley behind 1708 W. 6<sup>th</sup> St. would need to be initiated by the owners of the property affected. The property owner of 1708 W. 6<sup>th</sup> St. has offered to dedicate a portion of his property for alley to offset concerns of accessibility through the alley with increased traffic.

On September 1, 2005 the City Council passed on 1<sup>st</sup> reading a rezoning of 1706-1708 W Sixth St. from SF-3-NP to NO-MU-NP with 8 conditions. Two of those conditions, limiting access to Sixth St. and a 145 vehicle trip per day limit will be a conditional overlay in the ordinance. Five of the conditions; a masonry fence, dumpster prohibition, submittal of a site plan, commencement of construction and a rollback provision will be in a private restrictive covenant. One of the conditions requested the staff to explore the possibility of permitting the property to be legal non-complying/non conforming. The staff requested that the applicant present a list of those code requirements from which they were seeking exemption. Exemptions to the site development regulations would include the following:

1. Article 7: Section 25-6-471, Section 25-6-472 and the Transportation Criteria Manual: No paving/technical design with the exception of paving the driveway entrance and drive aisle.
2. Chapter 25-7: Drainage: No on-site detention required.
3. Article 6: Section 25-8-211 and Section 25-8-214: No water quality controls required.
4. Article 10: Section 25-2-1051 and Section 25-2-1066 and The Environmental Criteria Manual Section 2: Landscaping/Buffering not required except the masonry wall as required by the Neighborhood Plan, as amended.
5. Building Criteria Manual: Section 1, Section 4 and Section 5: To require no utility upgrades to commercial standards
6. Article 2: Section 25-2-492: To exceed the overall impervious cover and building coverage under NO base zoning district (objective is current improvements and related parking/driveway are ok)
7. Uniform Building Code: To not comply with major ADA or TAS renovations:
  - a) Except for 20% of the total cost of the overall remodel
  - b) Those areas on the first floor utilized for customer service and waiting

Staff had a meeting with the applicant's agent and items 4-7 were withdrawn. Staff cannot support the exemptions from these requirements. Staff is also unaware of a legal means to make exemptions from these Code requirements through the zoning process.

#### Item 1. Paved Parking

Since at least 1973, the City Code has required that commercial parking lots be paved with a hard surfacing material sufficient to prevent mud, dust, loose material, and other nuisances. The use of gravel or similar materials is not generally permitted because:

- Gravel cannot be striped; consequently, there is no way to delineate parking spaces.
- For drainage purposes, gravel is not considered pervious when used in parking lots because it eventually becomes compacted.
- Gravel is not an effective filtration device for water quality purposes unless it is periodically removed and replaced.
- Gravel may be a hazard for pedestrians and does not meet requirements for handicapped accessibility.
- Gravel can be carried into city streets and drainageways by automobiles or stormwater. Loose gravel on asphalt streets can be imbedded into the surface by vehicles, leading to pavement deterioration and potholes.

- Gravel produces dust in dry weather, and mud or standing water in wet weather.

Section 25-6-472 (H) of the Land Development Code requires parking areas comply with the Transportation Criteria Manual. There is not a variance procedure for this section of the Code. The Transportation Criteria Manual does allow the Director to approve crushed stone for parking in order to protect trees. In such cases the stone must be limited to the critical root zone of the trees and must be confined by curbing or other barriers to keep it in place. Crushed stone is not allowed on slopes, within handicapped parking spaces, or along accessible routes between parking and the building entry.

Staff recommends that Council not waive the requirement for paved parking but rather allow the applicant to pursue the use of an alternative surface based on the criteria in the Transportation Criteria Manual. If Council does choose to waive the requirement, however, the waiver should not apply to handicapped-accessible parking.

Based upon the floor area of the buildings on this site, the owner would be required to provide 12 regular spaces and 1 accessible space, which will require about 4000 square feet of paving, in addition to the driveway to W. 6th St.. It is unclear whether the applicant is asking for a waiver from the parking requirement or only the paving requirement. A variance from the parking requirement can only be granted by the Board of Adjustment unless a special ordinance is adopted for this property by City Council.

#### **Item 2. Chapter 25-7 Drainage:**

Impacts from new impervious cover will increase the run-off for the two, ten, twenty-five and one hundred year storms. Code requires on site detention for such development. Though the impact may be small for small amounts of impervious cover, it is the cumulative effect of many such projects that can be detrimental to our watersheds. However, if the applicant can demonstrate that a development's increase in run-off does not seriously impact any existing infrastructure then the applicant would be eligible to apply for a waiver to on-site detention. This process is in place in order to control, and offer relief from Code requirements, for just this type of project.

#### **Item 3. Article 6: Section 25-8-211 and Section 25-8-214 Water Quality**

On-site controls are required for cumulative increases of 5000 sq. ft or more, over base impervious cover, in the Urban watersheds. With certain developments, the applicant may be granted participation in "payment in lieu" of onsite water quality controls. This program allows difficult to treat, low impact developments to forego onsite treatment and compensate by contributing funds towards regional controls developed by the City. These mechanisms are in place to offer relief from Code for this type of development. Not requiring compliance would leave the regional program short funded.

The second reading of the ordinance for neighborhood office-mixed use-conditional overlay-neighborhood plan (NO-MU-CO-NP) combining district zoning was approved on October 20, 2005.

**EXISTING ZONING AND LAND USES:**

	<b>ZONING</b>	<b>LAND USES</b>
<i>Site</i>	SF-3-NP	OFFICE & RESIDENCE
<i>North</i>	ALLEY & SF-3-NP	SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCES
<i>South</i>	6 <sup>TH</sup> ST. & PUD	HARTLAND BANK PUD
<i>East</i>	LO-NP	OFFICE(S)
<i>West</i>	NO-NP	OFFICE

**NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN AREA:**            **TIA:** N/A  
Old West Austin Neighborhood Plan

**WATERSHED:** Town Lake/Johnson Creek **DESIRED DEVELOPMENT ZONE:** Yes

**CAPITOL VIEW CORRIDOR:** No            **HILL COUNTRY ROADWAY:** No

**NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATIONS:**

- #018 Old West Austin Neighborhood Assn.
- #511 Austin Neighborhoods Council
- #742 Austin Independent School District
- #998 West End Alliance

**SCHOOLS:**

- Mathews Elementary School
- Henry Middle School
- Austin High School

**CASE HISTORIES:**

<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>REQUEST</b>	<b>PLANNING COMMISSION</b>	<b>CITY COUNCIL</b>
Ord. # 000629-105	Zonings associated with the Neighborhood Plan	Approved staffs recommendations	Approved Staffs recommendations 6/29/2000 3 readings.

**RELATED CASES:**

C14-98-0018 – Request for rezoning from SF-3 to LO-MU. Staff recommended the rezoning. A valid petition against the proposed zoning was submitted to council. There was a lack of a second on the motion to approve the LO-MU zoning. The City Council on 10/01/1998 voted to deny the rezoning.

**ABUTTING STREETS:**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>ROW</b>	<b>PAVEMENT</b>	<b>CLASSIFICATION</b>	<b>NAME</b>
West 6 <sup>th</sup> Street	70'	40'	Arterial	West 6 <sup>th</sup> Street

**CITY COUNCIL DATES:**

July 28, 2005  
August 25, 2005  
September 1, 2005  
October 20, 2005  
December 1, 2005

**ACTION:**

**September 1, 2005:**

The first reading of the ordinance for neighborhood office-mixed use-conditional overlay-neighborhood plan (NO-MU-CO-NP) combining district zoning with conditions was approved with the following conditions.

1. All vehicular access for non-residential uses will be limited to a driveway to 6th street.
2. The 145 trip limitation would be allocated as 68 trips for 1706 West 6th and 77 trips for 1708 West 6th.
3. A masonry fence will be constructed along the north property lines.
4. Commercial trash dumpsters are prohibited.
5. A site plan will be submitted within 90 days after the final approval of the zoning and approval of the site plan will be diligently pursued or the nonresidential use will cease.
6. Construction of the driveway and masonry fence will commence within 120 days of approval of the site plan by the City and be diligently pursued by the City or any non-residential use will cease.
7. Direct City staff to explore the possibility of permitting the property to be legal non-complying/non-conforming.
8. If a non-residential use ceases pursuant to the site plan or construction requirements in 5 or 6 above, the non-residential use will not resume until a site plan is approved and the driveway and masonry wall are complete.

**October 20, 2005:**

The second reading of the ordinance for neighborhood office-mixed use-conditional overlay-neighborhood plan (NO-MU-CO-NP) combining district zoning was approved (consent). 7-0

**ORDINANCE READINGS:**

**1<sup>st</sup> – September 1, 2005**

**2<sup>nd</sup> – October 20, 2005**


**3<sup>rd</sup> – December 1, 2005**


**ORDINANCE NUMBER:**


**CASE MANAGER: Jorge E. Rousselin, NPZD**


**PHONE: 974-2975**

**E-MAIL: [jorge.rousselin@ci.austin.tx.us](mailto:jorge.rousselin@ci.austin.tx.us)**



 1" = 400'	SUBJECT TRACT PENDING CASE ZONING BOUNDARY CASE MGR: T. BOIT	  	<b>ZONING</b> CASE #: C14-05-0025 ADDRESS: 1708-1708 W 6TH ST SUBJECT AREA (acres): N/A	DATE: 05-02 NTLS: 6M	<b>CITY GRID REFERENCE NUMBER</b> H23
--	---	---	--	-------------------------	--







**Old West Austin  
Neighborhood Planning Area**

 Parks





# City of Austin Neighborhood Planning Areas



- Adopted Neighborhood Plan & Zoning
- Neighborhood Plan Underway
- Future Neighborhood Planning Area
- Non-Neighborhood Planning Area



This map has been produced by the City of Austin for the purpose of providing information and is not intended for any other use. It is provided as a courtesy of the City of Austin. For more information, please contact the City of Austin, Planning Department, 498 E. 11th Street, Austin, TX 78701.

**EXHIBIT A**



**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Members of the Planning Commission  
**CC:** Tom Bolt, COA Neighborhood Planning and Zoning Department  
Kris Kasper, Armbrust & Brown, LLP  
**FROM:** Emily Barron, COA Watershed Protection and Development Review Department  
**DATE:** May 18, 2005  
**SUBJECT:** Sub-Committee Follow Up for 1706 and 1708 W. 6<sup>th</sup> Street ~ C14-05-0025  
On Street Parking and Alley Maintenance

---

At the request of the Planning Commission's Neighborhood Planning Sub-Committee, staff is providing the following information regarding parallel on street parking on 6<sup>th</sup> Street and alley maintenance between Augusta Avenue and Patterson Avenue.

**On Street Parking:**

The neighborhood requested that parallel on street parking be provided along 6<sup>th</sup> Street. After discussions with the COA Public Works Department it has been determined that due to a vertical curve in the road, as well as the volume and high speed of traffic along 6<sup>th</sup> Street, on street parking can not be located here.

**Maintenance of the Alley:**

The alley located behind the subject tract is maintained by the COA's Public Works Street and Bridge South District office. Because there is no regularly scheduled maintenance program for alleys, alley maintenance is scheduled as Public Works receives calls from citizens. Staff will be coordinating with the applicant in the effort to realign the alley behind the subject tracts and provide maintenance of the alley between Augusta Avenue and Patterson Avenue.

---

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me at 974-2788.

Emily M. Barron  
Sr. Planner - Transportation Review  
Watershed Protection and Development Review Department

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Recommend rezoning from family residence - neighborhood plan combining district (SF-3-NP) zoning to neighborhood office – mixed use- conditional overlay - neighborhood combining plan (NO-MU-CO-NP) zoning. The Conditional Overlay limits the two properties to 145 trips per day combined, allows ingress only from W. 6<sup>th</sup> Street, egress only to the alley to the north, a minimum 10 foot vegetative buffer or 6' masonry fence separating the parking area for business use except where egress is located.

## **BACKGROUND**

Staff did not immediately move forward with rezoning of these properties, as there were issues with regard to the possibility of access to W. 6<sup>th</sup> Street in this location. Without any confirmation that a driveway permit could be issued staff was hesitant to move forward with any recommendation. The applicant was successful in obtaining a driveway permit in the past year. With the granting of an driveway permit staff felt comfortable moving forward with the request for rezoning and with the provisions for approval as outlined in the Neighborhood Plan. As staff received department review comments there was a realization that the prohibition and limitations to be placed in a Conditional Overlay might present practical difficulties and some safety issues; therefore staff recommends modification of the Conditional Overlay as mentioned in our recommendation.

## **BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION**

The proposed zoning should be consistent with the purpose statement of the district sought.

Neighborhood office (NO) district is the designation for a small office use that serves neighborhood or community needs, is located in or adjacent to a residential neighborhood and on a collector street that has a width of 40 feet or more, and does not unreasonably affect traffic. An office in an NO district may contain not more than one use. Site development regulations applicable to an NO district use are designed to preserve compatibility with existing neighborhoods through renovation and modernization of existing structures.

Zoning should not constitute a grant of special privilege to an individual owner; Granting of the request should result in an equal treatment of similarly situated properties

The streetscape along the north side of W. 6<sup>th</sup> Street is dominated with former single-family structures converted for office use.

Zoning changes should promote compatibility with adjacent and nearby uses.

The properties to the east and west in addition to properties to the south are developed with office occupancies

## **EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The subject properties are former single-family structures converted for office use without the proper building permits from the City of Austin. Currently the property at 1706 W. 6<sup>th</sup> St. is the subject of a zoning violation in which enforcement action is on hold pending the outcome of this zoning case. The structures are typical of the style housing in the neighborhood. The properties are elevated above W. 6<sup>th</sup> Street in this area with the only vehicular access being located on the alley to the rear (north) of the properties.

### **Site Characteristics**

Relatively flat, but elevated 4-6 feet above the curb on W. 6<sup>th</sup> St.

### **Environmental**

The site is located over the northern Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone. The site is located in the Johnson Creek Watershed of the Colorado River Basin, which is classified as an Urban Watershed by Chapter 25-8 of the City's Land Development Code. It is in the Desired Development Zone.

According to flood plain maps, there is no flood plain within the project area.

At this time, site-specific information is unavailable regarding existing trees and other vegetation, areas of steep slope, or other environmental features such as bluffs, springs, canyon rimrock, caves, sinkholes, and wetlands.

Standard landscaping and tree protection will be required in accordance with LDC 25-2 and 25-8 for all development and/or redevelopment.

### **Impervious Cover**

Impervious cover is not limited in this watershed class; therefore the zoning district impervious cover limits will apply.

### **Water Quality Control Requirements**

This site is required to provide on-site structural water quality controls (or payment in lieu of) for all development and/or redevelopment when 5,000 s.f. cumulative is exceeded, and detention for the two-year storm. At this time, no information has been provided as to whether this property has any pre-existing approvals, which would preempt current water quality or Code requirements.

### **Transportation**

Right-of-way for the portion of the alley that is currently existing but not dedicated should be dedicated as public right-of-way.

Per the Neighborhood Plan each property is recommended to be limited to 40 vehicle trips per day. However, the current structures could generate (as office use) greater than 40 vehicle trips per day on each lot. Staff recommends that the *combined* trip generation for both lots be limited to 145 trips per day. This allows for the existing 2,070s.f. and 2,488s.f. structures to be developed for office use.

The Neighborhood Plan recommends no access to the alley; however, considering the difference in elevation of the property and W. 6<sup>th</sup> St at the front property line, the amount of traffic on W. 6th Street, and the site constraints disallowing for a driveway of adequate width to accommodate both ingress and egress from W. 6th Street, staff recommends that a joint access entry driveway be permitted along W. 6th Street and the exit from the properties be allowed on the alley.

There are existing sidewalks along 6<sup>th</sup> Street.

6<sup>th</sup> Street is classified in the Bicycle Plan as a Priority 1 bike route.

Capital Metro bus service is available along 6<sup>th</sup> Street.

#### Water and Wastewater

The landowner intends to serve the tract with City of Austin water and wastewater utility service. If water or wastewater utility improvements are required, the landowner will be responsible for all cost and for providing the utility improvements.

#### Stormwater Detention

At the time a final subdivision plat, subdivision construction plans, or site plan is submitted, the developer must demonstrate that the proposed development will not result in additional identifiable flooding of other property. Any increase in stormwater runoff will be mitigated through on-site stormwater detention ponds, or participation in the City of Austin Regional Stormwater Management Program if available.

#### Compatibility Standards

The site is subject to compatibility standards. Along the north property line, the following standards apply:

- No structure may be built within 15 feet of the property line.
- No structure in excess of two stories or 30 feet in height may be constructed within 50 feet of the property line.
- No structure in excess of three stories or 40 feet in height may be constructed within 100 feet of the property line.
- No parking is allowed 5' of the property line.
- There is a 0' setback for driveways on both lots.

- **A fence, berm, or dense vegetation must be provided to screen adjoining properties from views of parking, mechanical equipment, storage, and refuse collection.**
- **Additional design regulations will be enforced at the time a site plan is submitted.**

*8th fl.*

**CITY OF AUSTIN  
RESIDENTIAL PERMIT APPLICATION**

BP Number 89-04-9804 KA  
 Building Permit No. \_\_\_\_\_  
 Plat No. 218 Date 12/14/04  
 Reviewer SPB

**PRIMARY PROJECT DATA**

Service Address 1706 West 6th Street Tax Parcel No. 01090402130000  
 Legal Description  
 Lot 9 Block A Subdivision Eck's Heights Section \_\_\_\_\_ Phase \_\_\_\_\_  
 If in a Planned Unit Development, provide Name and Case No. \_\_\_\_\_  
 (attach final approved copies of subdivision and site plan)  
 If this site is not a legally subdivided lot, you must contact the Development Assistance Center for a Land Status Determination.  
 Description of Work \_\_\_\_\_ Remodel (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Addition (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
 New Residence  
 Duplex  
 Garage  attached  detached  
 Carport  attached  detached  
 Pool  Other (specify) Driveway Permit  
 Zoning (e.g. SF-1, SF-2...) SF-3 R/P Height of building \_\_\_\_\_ ft. # of floors \_\_\_\_\_  
 On lots with LA zoning, the approved septic permit must be submitted with the Residential Permit application for zoning approval.  
 (LDC 25-2-551(B)(6))  
 Does this site have a Board of Adjustment ruling?  Yes  No If yes, attach the B.O.A. documentation  
 Will this development require a cut and fill in excess of 4 feet?  Yes  No  
 Does this site front a paved street?  Yes  No A paved alley?  Yes  No

**VALUATIONS FOR REMODELS ONLY**

Building	\$ _____
Electrical	\$ _____
Mechanicals	\$ _____
Plumbing	\$ _____
Driveway & Sidewalk	\$ _____
<b>TOTALS</b>	_____
(Labor and materials)	

**DATA FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION OR ADDITIONS ONLY**

Lot Size	_____ sq. ft.
Job Valuation \$	_____ (Labor and materials)
<b>Total Job Valuation (remodels and additions)</b>	_____ (Labor and materials)

**PERMIT FEES (For office use only)**

	NEW/ADDITIONS	REMODEL
Building	\$ _____	\$ _____
Electrical	\$ _____	\$ _____
Mechanicals	\$ _____	\$ _____
Plumbing	\$ _____	\$ _____
Driveway & Sidewalk	\$ <u>22.00</u>	\$ _____
<b>TOTALS</b>	_____	_____

**OWNER / BUILDER INFORMATION**

OWNER Name Jeffrey C. & Sarah E. Leon Telephone (h) 32-2501  
 (w) \_\_\_\_\_  
 BUILDER Company Name \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone \_\_\_\_\_  
 Contact/Applicant's Name \_\_\_\_\_ Pager \_\_\_\_\_  
 DRIVEWAY /SIDEWALK Contractor \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone \_\_\_\_\_  
 CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY Name \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone \_\_\_\_\_  
 Address \_\_\_\_\_ City \_\_\_\_\_ ST \_\_\_\_\_ ZIP \_\_\_\_\_

If you would like to be notified when your application is approved, please select the method:  
 \_\_\_\_\_ telephone \_\_\_\_\_ e-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

You may check the status of this application at [www.ci.austin.tx.us/development/permits.htm](http://www.ci.austin.tx.us/development/permits.htm)

Service Address 1706 West 6th Street

Applicant's Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

**BUILDING COVERAGE**

The area of a lot covered by buildings or roofed areas, but not including (i) incidental projecting eaves and similar features, or (ii) ground level paving, landscaping, or open recreational facilities.

	Lot 1 Existing	sq. ft.	Lot 9 Existing	sq. ft.
a. 1 <sup>st</sup> floor conditioned area	1275	sq. ft.	1450	sq. ft.
b. 2 <sup>nd</sup> floor conditioned area		sq. ft.		sq. ft.
c. 3 <sup>rd</sup> floor conditioned area		sq. ft.		sq. ft.
d. Basement	0	sq. ft.	0	sq. ft.
e. Garage / Carport				
attached	0	sq. ft.	0	sq. ft.
detached	378	sq. ft.	746	sq. ft.
f. Wood decks (must be counted at 100%)	100	sq. ft.	517	sq. ft.
g. Breezeways	0	sq. ft.	0	sq. ft.
h. Conc / Asphalt	1186	sq. ft.	557	sq. ft.
i. Covered porches	0	sq. ft.	95	sq. ft.
j. Balconies	0	sq. ft.	0	sq. ft.
k. Swimming pool(s) (pool surface area(s))	0	sq. ft.	0	sq. ft.
l. Other building or covered area(s)	150	sq. ft.	1075	sq. ft.
<del>at self-WoodShed (lot 1) Carport Gravel (lot 9)</del>				
<b>TOTAL BUILDING AREA (add a. through l.)</b>	<b>3089</b>	<b>sq. ft.</b>	<b>4440</b>	<b>sq. ft.</b>

**TOTAL BUILDING COVERAGE ON LOT (abstract b., c., d., and k. if applicable)** 3089/4440 sq. ft.  
69.54% / 50% of lot

**IMPERVIOUS COVERAGE**

Includes building cover and sidewalks, driveways, uncovered patios, decks, air conditioning equipment pads, and other improvements in calculating impervious cover. Roof overhangs which do not exceed two feet or which are used for solar screening are not included in building coverage or impervious coverage. All water must drain away from buildings on this site and buildings on adjacent lots.

a. Total building coverage on lot (see above)	_____	sq. ft.
b. Driveway area on private property	_____	sq. ft.
c. Sidewalk / walkways on private property	_____	sq. ft.
d. Uncovered patios	_____	sq. ft.
e. Uncovered wood decks (may be counted at 50%)	_____	sq. ft.
f. Air conditioner pads	_____	sq. ft.
g. Concrete decks	_____	sq. ft.
h. Other (specify) _____	_____	sq. ft.

**TOTAL IMPERVIOUS COVERAGE (add a. through h.)** \_\_\_\_\_ sq. ft.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ % of lot

CITY OF AUSTIN  
RESIDENTIAL PERMIT APPLICATION

I understand that in accordance with Sections 25-1-411 and 25-11-66 of the Land Development Code (LDC), non-compliance with the LDC may be cause for the Building Official to suspend or revoke a permit and/or license. I understand that I am responsible for complying with any subdivision notes, deed restrictions, restrictive covenants and/or zoning conditional overlays prohibiting certain uses and/or requiring certain development restrictions (i.e., height, access, screening, etc.) on this property. If a conflict should result with any of these restrictions, it will be my responsibility to resolve it. I understand that, if requested, I must provide copies of all subdivision plat notes, deed restrictions, restrictive covenants, and/or zoning conditional overlay information that may apply to this property.

I acknowledge that this project qualifies for the Site Plan Exemption as listed in Section 25-5-2 of the LDC.

I also understand that if there are any trees greater than 19 inches in diameter located on the property and immediately adjacent to the proposed construction, I am to schedule a Tree Ordinance review by contacting (512) 974-1876 and receive approval to proceed.

APPLICANT'S  
SIGNATURE

*Sarah Leon*  
Sarah Leon

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

Rejection Notes/Additional Comments (for office use only):

Multiple horizontal lines for rejection notes and additional comments.

**JOINT USE ACCESS EASEMENT**

THE STATE OF TEXAS  
COUNTY OF TRAVIS

§  
§  
§

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS:

This Joint Use Access Easement is made by and between SARA HARDNER LEON and JEFFREY C. LEON, individuals residing in Travis County, Texas (collectively, "Leon") and DONALD E HENRY, Jr. and PATRICIA A. ALVEY, individuals residing in Travis County, Texas (collectively, "Henry") (both Leon and Henry shall be referred to as an "Owner") and is as follows:

**RECITALS:**

- A. Leon is the owner of that certain property more particularly described as Lot 9, Block A, Eck's Heights, a subdivision in Travis County, Texas, according to the map or plat thereof recorded in Volume 3, Page 16, of the Real Property Records of Travis County, Texas (the "Leon Property").
- B. Henry is the owner of that certain property more particularly described as Lot 1, West End Heights, a subdivision in Travis County, Texas, according to the map or plat thereof recorded in Volume 3, Page 20 of the Real Property Records of Travis County, Texas (the "Henry Property") (Leon Property and Henry Property shall be collectively referred to as the "Property").
- C. Leon desires to impress the Leon Property with a joint access easement for the benefit of the Henry Property, and Henry desires to impress the Henry Property with a joint access easement for the benefit of the Leon Property.

NOW, THEREFORE, it is hereby declared: (i) that all of the Property shall be held, sold, conveyed and occupied subject to the following covenants, conditions, restrictions, easements, liens and charges, which are for the purpose of protecting the value and desirability of, and which shall run with the Property and shall be binding on all parties having any right, title or interest in or to the Property or any part thereof, their heirs, successors and assigns; and (ii) that each contract or deed which may be executed with regard to the Property or any portion thereof shall conclusively be held to have been executed, delivered and accepted subject to the following covenants, conditions, restrictions, easements, liens and charges, regardless of whether the same are set out or referred to in said contract or deed:

- 1. **Joint Use Access Easement.** Leon has granted, sold and conveyed and by these presents does hereby grant, sell and convey unto Henry a non-exclusive, perpetual easement appurtenant to the Henry Property. Henry has granted, sold and conveyed and by these presents does hereby grant, sell and convey unto Leon a non-exclusive, perpetual easement appurtenant to the Leon Property. Based upon these grants, each Owner shall have an easement over and across a portion of the Property, more particularly described on the attached Exhibit "A" (the "Easement Tract"), for the purpose of providing a free flow of vehicular and pedestrian ingress and egress over and across the driveway which is to be constructed upon the Easement Tract (the "Driveway") from such Owner's property to a private or public thoroughfare. The agreed diagram for construction of improvements constituting the Driveway is attached hereto as Exhibit "B" and is hereby approved by Leon and Henry (the "Approved Driveway"). Any additional improvements on the Easement Tract necessary or desirable for the Driveway will be constructed of material and in the location mutually agreed upon by Leon and Henry. The easement, rights and privileges granted hereunder shall be perpetual.
- 2. **Construction and Maintenance Obligations.** Except for the Approved Driveway, no building, structure, or other improvement shall be placed upon any portion of the Easement Tract without the advanced written approval of Leon and Henry, their successors and assigns.

Joint Use Agreement

No construction on the Easement Tract shall commence without prior approval of both Leon and Henry. The cost and expense associated with the construction, repair and maintenance of any paving and roadway improvements upon the Easement Tract associated with the Approved Driveway shall be borne fifty percent (50%) by Leon and fifty percent (50%) by Henry. Leon will construct, maintain and repair the paving and roadway improvements necessary for the Approved Driveway. Any reimbursement for a cost or expense incurred by Leon to construct, repair or maintain any paving and roadway improvements constructed upon the Easement Tract shall be considered due to Leon within fifteen (15) days of the Henry's receipt of an appropriate invoice for such work.

3. **Exclusivity.** The easements, rights and privileges herein granted are non-exclusive, and the Owners will have the right to enter upon and use that portion of the Easement Tract belonging to such Owner for any purpose which is not inconsistent with the easements, rights and privileges granted hereunder. Owners will also be entitled to grant such other easements on or across the Easement Tract not otherwise inconsistent with the easements, rights and privileges granted hereunder.

4. **Restoration Obligations.** Each Owner hereby agrees that it shall bear its costs and expenses including those incurred by their agents, employees and contractors for property damage to the Easement Tract, including the restoration to its previous physical condition of any sidewalk, curb and gutter, roadway or similar improvements or other facilities located upon, within or adjacent to the Easement Tract.

5. **Obligations To Run With The Land.** The obligations of each Owner created with this Joint Access Easement shall run with the land and shall be binding upon future owners of the Property and such owners' heirs, representatives, successors and assigns.

6. **Sale of Lots.** If either Leon or Henry sells all or any portion of either the Leon Property or the Henry Property, such Owner will be released and discharged from any all obligations as an Owner arising under this Joint Use Access Easement after the date of the conveyance of title to such property, but shall remain liable for all obligations arising under this Joint Use Access Easement prior to the date of conveyance of title. The new owner will be liable for all obligations arising under this Joint Use Access Easement with respect to such property after the date of conveyance of title to such property.

7. **Severability and Construction.** The provisions contained herein shall be deemed independent and severable, and the invalidity or partial invalidity of any provision or portion thereof shall not affect the validity or enforceability of any other provision or portion thereof. Unless the context requires a contrary construction, the singular shall include the plural and the plural the singular. All captions and titles used in this instrument are intended solely for convenience of reference and shall not enlarge, limit or otherwise affect that which is set forth in any of the paragraphs hereof.

8. **Entire Agreement.** This instrument contains the entire agreement between the parties relating to the rights herein granted and the obligations herein assumed. Any oral representations or modifications concerning this instrument shall be of no force and effect excepting in a subsequent modification in writing, signed by the party to be charged.

9. **Attorney's Fees.** In the event of any controversy, claim or dispute relating to this instrument or the breach thereof, the prevailing party shall be entitled to recover from the non-prevailing party reasonable expenses, attorney's fees and costs.

10. **Indemnity.** The Owners hereby agree to and shall indemnify and hold harmless each other from any and all liability, damage, expense, cause of action, suits, claims (including attorney's fees), or judgments arising out of or connected to the use of the Easement Tract, except if such liability, etc., is caused by the sole act, failure to act, or negligence of the other party, its agents, employees, invitees or guests.

11. **Binding Effect.** This instrument shall bind and inure to the benefit of the respective parties, their personal representatives, successors and assigns.

Executed to be effective on this 1 day of October, 2002.

**LEON:**

Sara Hardner Leon  
Sara Hardner Leon

Jeffrey C. Leon  
Jeffrey C. Leon

**HENRY:**

Donald E. Henry, Jr.  
Donald E. Henry, Jr.

Patricia A. Alvey  
Patricia A. Alvey

STATE OF TEXAS §

COUNTY OF TRAVIS §

This instrument was acknowledged before me on the 1st day of Oct., 2002, by Sara Hardner Leon, an individual residing in Travis County, Texas.



Magdalena G. Powell  
Notary Public, State of Texas

STATE OF TEXAS §

COUNTY OF TRAVIS §

This instrument was acknowledged before me on the 1st day of Oct., 2002, by Jeffrey C. Leon, an individual residing in Travis County, Texas.



Magdalena G. Powell  
Notary Public, State of Texas

STATE OF TEXAS §

COUNTY OF TRAVIS §

This instrument was acknowledged before me on the \_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2002, by Donald E Henry, Jr., an individual residing in Travis County, Texas.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public, State of Texas

STATE OF TEXAS §


COUNTY OF TRAVIS §

This instrument was acknowledged before me on the 16 day of July, 2002, by Patricia A. Alvey, an individual residing in Travis County, Texas.

*Magdalena G. Barnard*  
Notary Public, State of Texas

**AFTER RECORDING RETURN TO:**

Kristofer Kasper  
ARMERUET & BROWN, L.L.P.  
100 Congress Avenue, Suite 1300  
Austin, Texas 78701



**EXHIBIT "A"**

**Easement Tract**

**Joint Use Agreement**

EXHIBIT "B"

Approved Driveway



## Closed Caption Log, Council Meeting, 9/26/02

Note: Since these log files are derived from the Closed Captions created during the Channel 6 live cablecasts, there are occasional spelling and grammatical errors. These Closed Caption logs are not official records of Council Meetings and cannot be relied on for official purposes. For official records or transcripts, please contact the City Clerk at 974-2210.

Mayor Garcia: THANK YOU, MR. LARKIN. OKAY. SARAH LEE YOUNG AND MELISSA GONZALES ARE BOTH REGISTERED ON ITEM NUMBER 26. THAT'S A CONSENT ITEM. WELCOME.

#26?  
GOOD AFTERNOON MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL. THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR ALLOWING ME TO ADDRESS YOU TODAY. I OWN A PIECE OF PROPERTY AT 17067 WEST SIXTH STREET. I FILED LETTERS WITH YOUR STAFF IN REGARDS TO THAT PROPERTY. AND I'M ALSO HERE ON BEHALF OF OUR NEXT DOOR NEIGHBORHOOD, ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNER, 1706 WEST SIXTH STREET. THESE PROPERTIES ARE THE ONLY REMAINING SF-3 PROPERTIES ON THAT ENTIRE STRETCH OF SIXTH STREET. IT HAS -- WE HAVE COMMERCIAL USE ALL AROUND US AND WE WOULD LIKE TO BE INCLUDED IN THE UPGRADED ZONING THAT YOU ARE DOING IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NEIGHBORHOOD PLANS. AND ESSENTIALLY WE WANT TO BE TREATED LIKE THE OTHER PROPERTIES ON SIXTH STREET IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN, WHICH WOULD BE TO UPGRADE THOSE TWO PROPERTIES TO AN N.O. WITH A CONDITIONAL OVERLAY. I WOULD SPECIFICALLY ASKED -- I SIGNED IN FAVOR, BUT I WOULD OBJECT TO BEING EXCLUDE FROM THE UPGRADE OF THE SURROUNDING AREAS UNLESS WE COULD ALSO BE INCLUDED SIMILARLY. AND I WOULD ASK THE COUNCIL TO DIRECT STAFF TO INITIATE A ZONING CHANGE AT 1706 AND 1708 WEST SIXTH STREET IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE EXISTING NEIGHBORHOOD PLANS. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

Mayor Garcia: ALICE RAILROAD GREG, CAN YOU ADDRESS THAT ISSUE? ALICE OR GREG.

I'M GREG GURN GURNSEY, PLANNING AND ZONING DEPARTMENT. WE DID RECEIVE TWO LETTERS ABOUT THESE TWO PROPERTIES, 1706 AND 1708 WEST SIXTH STREET. THE PETITIONS WOULD BE AGAINST -- SINCE THERE'S NO BASE DISTRICT ZONING CHANGE IN THE PROPERTY, FROM THE SF-3 THAT EXISTS, IT WOULD BE A COMBINING DISTRICT. IN ORDER TO OPPOSE THAT TO HAVE A VALID PETITION, WE WOULD NEED 20% OF THE LAND OTHER NEIGHBORHOOD TO OPPOSE IT. IT'S MY UNDERSTANDING TALKING WITH SARAH THAT SHE'S NOT NECESSARILY OPPOSED TO THE NP, BUT SHILD LIKE THOSE TWO PROPERTIES TO BE UP ZONED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ADOPTED PLAN AND HER AND HER NEIGHBOR WOULD BE AGREEABLE TO THE CONDITIONAL OVERLAY THAT WOULD BE PLACED ON THE PROPERTY THROUGH A ZONING CHANGE.

THAT WOULD MAKE IT IMPORTANT TO THE PLAN. SO I GUESS WHAT SHE HAS ASKING FROM YOU IS THAT COUNCIL DIRECT STAFF TO INITIATE A ZONING CHANGE ON ON THESE TWO PROPERTIES TO BE SIMILAR TO THE ZONING ON EITHER SIDE OF HER PROPERTY, WHICH IS CURRENTLY LIKE AN LO AND NO. THAT IS YOUR PREROGATIVE. YOU CAN CERTAINLY DIRECT US TO GO DO THAT. IT WOULD BE AT NO EXPENSE TO HER AND HER NEIGHBOR. I THINK EARLIER ON THEY WERE INVOLVED WITH THE PROCESS STAFF THAT COULD HAVE INCLUDED THAT CHANGE EARLIER ON IN THE PROCESS AND PROVIDED FOR THE NECESSARY NOTICE. TODAY WITHOUT HAVING THE PROPER POSTING, THE PROPER NOTIFICATION, WE COULD NOT UP ZONE THESE TWO TRACTS TODAY.

Mayor Garcia: SO WE CAN DO TODAY WHAT'S ON THE AGENDA AND THEN LATER ON BRING THAT ITEM?

THAT'S CORRECT. ~~STAFF TO INITIATE A ZONING CHANGE ON THESE TWO PROPERTIES AND BRING THIS BACK FOR OFFICE ZONING.~~

Mayor Garcia: DOES IT HAVE TO GO BACK TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD GROUPS?

IT WOULD HAVE TO GO BACK TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR THEIR RECOMMENDATION. IT WOULD BE TREATED AS ANOTHER APPLICATION.

Mayor Garcia: QUESTIONS FOR MR. GURNSEY?

Thomas: > WYNN: MAYOR? BRIEFLY, IT SEEMS TO ME THAT PART OF THE WHO' NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING PROCESS, THESE TRACTS WOULD HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED AS A DIFFERENT BASE ZONING CATEGORY THAN OTHER PROPERTIES UP AND DOWN THE STREET THERE AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING PROCESS WOULD HAVE LIKELY RECOMMENDED AT LEAST A MIXED USE RECOMMENDATION. WHY DIDN'T THAT HAPPEN AS PART OF THE OVERALL PLAN?

I READ THE PLAN BRIEFLY WHEN WE WERE OUTSIDE ~~THE PLAN SAID SOME CONDITIONS~~ THAT THE OWNER WOULD HAVE TO AGREE TO ABOUT LIMITING ACCESS AND PROVIDING SOME BUFFERS. THE PLAN ACTUALLY SAID IT COULD BE USED FOR RESIDENTIAL BUT IT IS NOT USED FOR RESIDENTIAL FOR A BUSINESS PURPOSE. THERE'S SOME LIMITATIONS ON ACCESS, THERE'S CONDITIONS FOR A BUFFER AND ~~SINCE THE PROPERTY OWNERS WERE NOT AWARE OF THIS~~ SINCE THE PROPERTY OWNERS WERE NOT AWARE OF THIS GOING ON AND DID NOT ALERT STAFF, WE DID NOT PLAN FOR THE UP ZONE OF THIS PARCEL. IN THE PAST THE PROPERTIES ON EITHER SIDE HAVE PAID THEIR OWN FEES AND ASKED FOR REZONING. THEY COULD BE MADE A PART OF THIS PROCESS AND I THINK THE PROPERTY OWNERS AND THE STAFF HAD A DESIRE TO CHANGE THE ZONING.

Wynn: IS SEEMS LIKE PART OF THE PROCESS, WE TRY TO IDENTIFY PERHAPS A COUPLE – IF THERE'S AN INDIVIDUAL TRACT OR TWO THAT'S OUT OF PLACE HAVE A ZONING CATEGORY ALONG A COMMERCIAL EAST NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN, WE IDENTIFY THAT AND WE DON'T – I DIDN'T THINK WE HAD TO RELAY ON THE PROPERTY OWNER TO RECOGNIZE THAT PERHAPS THEIR PROPERTY WAS UNDERZONED.

I THINK IN THIS PARTICULAR INSTANCE IF THOSE PARCELS THAT IT COULD HAVE BEEN USED EITHER WAY AS A RESIDENT STILL TAKING ACCESS TO THE ALLEY. OR IF THERE'S A CHOICE OF GOING TO COMMERCIAL THAT THE ALLEY ACCESS IN THIS CASE WOULD BE LIMITED AND BUFFERS PROVIDED. I THINK WHAT I SAW IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN WAS PEOPLE COMING IN AND TALKING TO THE LADY AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNER, IT COULD GO EITHER WAY ON THIS PARTICULAR TRACK.

Wynn: THANK YOU, MAYOR.

Mayor Garcia: MAYOR PRO TEM?

Goodman: I WAS GOING TO ASK IF THERE HAS TO BE A SPECIFIC MOTION TO – WHAT IS THE WORD WE USE FOR PLUCKING OUT? WE PASS THE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN ON SECOND AND THIRD READING, BUT WITHOUT?

THIS IS JUST THE ZONING CASE BEFORE YOU. SO IF COUNCIL WOULD LIKE, YOU COULD GO AHEAD WITH YOUR MOTION TO DIRECT STAFF TO INITIATE A REZONING OF THESE PARCELS. IT'S MY UNDERSTANDING TALKING TO SARAH AND SHE DID NOT OBJECT TO HAVING THE NP, SHE WOULD LIKE THE OTHER OFFICE OPTION. SO WE COULD GO FORWARD WITH THE ZONING CASE TODAY TO APPLY THE NP, AND THEN WHAT SHE WOULD CERTAINLY LIKE WOULD BE FOR COUNCIL TO INITIATE STAFF TO REZONE THESE PARCELS TO BE PART OF THE COMMERCIAL PROPOSAL THAT'S ALLOWED UNDER THE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN. USE RECOMMENDED BY THE OVERALL PLAN.

Goodman: BUT THEN HAVEN'T WE DE FACTO IN THE FUTURE WHEN IT COMES BACK, AMENDED THE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN? IRK THE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN WOULD NOT HAVE TO BE AMENDED IF THE DIFFERENT RESTRICTIONS THAT ARE OUTLINED IN THE PLAN, WHICH I'VE BEEN TOLD SHE IS IN AGREEMENT WITH, THOSE COULD BE INCORPORATED WITH THE CO, SO THIS WOULD BE GOING FROM SF-3 NP TO, I GUESS, N.O.-CO-NP WITH THOSE RESTRICTIONS WITHOUT A CHANGE TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN. AND THAT COULD BE DONE AT A LATER DATE.

Goodman: IT DOESN'T AMEND THE LETTERS, THE LAND USE THAT WAS LAID OUT BY THE NEIGHBORHOOD PLANS. THEY DIDN'T CHANGE – DO YOU KNOW WHAT I MEAN? MAYBE WE'RE NOT DOING ANYTHING, BUT I'M NOT COMFORTABLE WITH ANYTHING THAT FEELS LIKE THAT.



Mayor Garcia: COUNCILMEMBER SLUSHER.

Slusher: SO I'M NOT CLEAR ON, ONE, WAS THIS DISCUSSED BY THE PLANNING TEAM, THE NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING TEAM, THIS PARTICULAR ISSUE?

LET ME LET ONE OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNERS DISCUSS ABOUT THOSE MEETINGS.

THE NEIGHBORHOOD ZONING NOTED THAT THERE WERE A SMALL HANDFUL OF PROPERTIES ON SIXTH STREET THAT STILL HAD SF-3 ZONING IN THAT AREA. AND WROTE A SPECIFIC PROVISION INTO THE PLAN LAYING OUT THE CONDITIONS THAT THEY WOULD FIND ACCEPTABLE IF SOMEONE WERE TO COME IN AND REZONE THAT PROPERTY TO A NEIGHBORHOOD OFFICE CATEGORY. BUT THEY OPTED NOT DO THAT REZONING, BUT LEAVE THE DOOR FOR SOMEBODY TO COME IF THEY COULD MEET THESE SPECIFIC CONDITIONS.

Slusher: IS THAT WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT HERE? MEETING THESE CONDITIONS THAT ARE LAID OUT?

SHE SAID SHE WOULD BE AGREEABLE TO THE CONDITIONS LAID OUT IN THE PLAN?

Slusher: AND THAT'S WHAT Y'ALL DETERMINED BEFORE YOU BRING IT BACK TO US. WOULD BE TO BRING IT BACK TO US. YOU SAID NO AND THEY SHOOK THEIR HEAD YES. MAYBE WE OUGHT TO GET A VERBAL.

AS I UNDERSTAND, SHE IS AGREEABLE TO THE DIFFERENT CONDITIONS THAT ARE LAID OUT IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN. WE COULD NOT TAKE ACTION ON THOSE TODAY. IF COUNCIL INSTRUCTED US TO INITIATE A NEW CASE WE COULD BRING BACK A NEW ZONING CASE THAT HAS THOSE CONDITIONS THAT ARE IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN AND MAKE THAT A PART OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE IN THE FUTURE.

Slusher: OKAY. WHAT YOU'RE SAYING IS THE PROCESS IS LAID OUT BY THE NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING TEAM.

THAT'S CORRECT.

Goodman: THE ZONING TODAY ALL HAS NP ON IT, RIGHT?

THAT'S CORRECT.

Goodman: SO THE ZONING AT THIS MOMENT IS NP, AND THE NEW PROCESS, THE REZONING PROCESS WILL BE REZONING SF-3-NP TO N.O.-CO-NP?





**Bolt, Thomas**

---

**From:** Kris Kasper [KKasper@abaustin.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 19, 2005 2:55 PM  
**To:** Bolt, Thomas  
**Subject:** FW: support letters

Don't know if you have this. Thanks.

Dear Mr Bolt,

I live at 1825 Waterston, just block from the properties applying for NO zoning. I support that NO zoning for A 1706 (Sara and Jeffrey Leon) and 1708 (Don Henry and Patty Alvey West 6th Street which is scheduled to go before the Planning and Zoning Commission on April 26, 2005. These properties would be changed to NO zoning with additional limitations (such as limitations on traffic and requirements for a visual barrier at the alleyway), as specified by the Old West Austin Neighborhood Plan -- approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

At the direction of the City Council, their staff has filed an application to modify the current SF-3 to NO zoning, in conformance with the Neighborhood plan. The property at 1706 is currently being used as a small law firm, and the property at 1708 is currently owned by Don Henry and until recently was used as their home. I am expressing support for the proposed rezoning.

A

Feel free to email or call me:

A

Aralyn Hughes

Clarksville resident for 25 years

Former Neighborhood (OWANA) Board Member

512-476-0682

A

A

**Barley & Pfeiffer Architects**  
Comprehensive Sustainable Architecture, Interiors, and Consulting

Thomas Bolt  
City of Austin Neighborhood Planning and Zoning  
Via fax: 974-6054

April 7, 2005

**Re: Case number C14-05-0025 Sarah and Jeffrey Leon's request for 1706 and 1708 NO zoning**

Dear Thomas:

I expressed my support for this zoning change on the phone with you a few weeks ago and I wanted to follow up with a letter of support. I hope it is still timely to do so.

This case is of particular interest to those of us concerned about the long term viability of this neighborhood. Presently it serves as a positive example of Jane Jacobs' book on living and working environments successfully co-existing. I am afraid that if this zoning change is not granted than the best use for these properties, given their location on busy West 6<sup>th</sup> Street, would revert to transient residential housing. We had that in this area fifteen years ago when I first purchased my property and I would hate to see a reversion to this. The neighborhood is cleaner, healthier, and more vibrant now.

The two properties referenced in this case have had businesses running out of them for quite a while and there have no problems with such. These properties have been accessed from the public alley behind them and that seems to work very well - and seems to keep the traffic situation safer than if access would be attempted from 6<sup>th</sup> Street.

I know this is a sensitive issue to some of those living nearby, but am speaking from my heart. We all must do our part to diminish the pressures that encourage suburban sprawl.

Should you have any further questions about this, please do not hesitate to contact me

Warmest Regards,



**Peter L. Pfeiffer FAIA**  
VAIREA PROPERTIES and BARLEY + PFEIFFER ARCHITECTS  
property owners of 1800, 1802, 1804 West 6th Street and 604 Patterson Street

**Barkley & Associates**  
Certified Public Accountants

March 21, 2005

Mr. Thomas Bolt  
City of Austin  
Neighborhood Planning and Zoning Department  
P. O. Box 1088  
Austin, Texas 78767

Case Number: C14-05-0025-1706-1708 West 6<sup>th</sup> Street


Dear Mr. Bolt:

I am the owner of the property located at 1704 West 6<sup>th</sup> Street. I am completely in support of the application to change the zoning on the properties located at 1706 and 1708 West 6<sup>th</sup> Street.

All of the other property on the south side of the block is already zoned for commercial use as is, so far as I know, virtually all of the property on 6<sup>th</sup> Street between Lamar and Mopac. I do not feel that a change in zoning would have any adverse impact on surrounding properties from either an esthetic point of view or from traffic flow changes.

Should you have any questions regarding my support, please give me a call.

Sincerely,



Clifton W. Barkley

**Bolt, Thomas**

---

**From:** Chris John [chris@unitedbenefitadvisors.com]

**Subject:** Case Number C14-05-0025-1706-1708 West 6th Street

Mr. Bolt

I am the owner of the property located at 1700 West 6th Street, and I am firmly in support of the application to change the zoning of the properties located at 1706 and 1708 West 6th Street.

As far as I know (with the exception of these two parcels) the all of the properties on both sides of this block are zoned for commercial use. The properties at 1706 and 1708 are not suitable for single family use (especially families with small children). Traffic on 6th street can be heavy and noisy, as drivers prepare to ramp onto MoPac. The only use these properties are suited for is small office use. I do not feel that a change in zoning would have any adverse impact on any of the surrounding properties from either a financial, esthetic or traffic point of view. In fact it seems to me that the small offices along the north side of this block act as an important noise buffer for the neighborhood to the north of us.

Please approve this zoning change. Feel free to call me regarding my support if you have any questions.

Chris John,

Chief Executive Officer and Co-Founder,  
United Benefit Advisors (UBA),  
"An Alliance of The Nation's Premier Independent Benefit Advisory Firms"  
1700 West 6th Street, Suite "A"  
Austin, TX 78703  
Email: (chris@unitedbenefitadvisors.com) (Please note new address)  
Office: 512-617-8713  
Fax: 512-478-8786  
Corporate Website: (<http://unitedbenefitadvisors.com>)  
Employer Website: (<http://benefits.com>)

*This e-mail message, including all attachments is intended solely for the use of addressee(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information or information otherwise protected by law. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure, distribution, copying, or forwarding of this message or its attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the message and all copies and backups thereof.*

4/25/2005

**Bolt, Thomas**

---

**From:** Blake Buffington [bbuffington@buffingtonlaw.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 21, 2005 3:59 PM  
**To:** Bolt, Thomas; greg.gumsey@ci.austin.tx.us

Messrs. Bolt and Gurnsey,

This email is being sent in support of the above referenced application.

I am writing to you as the owner of a small business on the adjacent NO zoned property which is located at 1710 West Sixth Street. Following my review of the Old West Austin Neighborhood Plan and in light of the predominant use of property along 6th Street, it is my opinion that the City should approve a zoning change on the subject property from SF-3 to NO.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Blake Buffington  
The Buffington Law Firm, P.C.  
1710 West Sixth Street  
Austin, Texas 78703  
(512) 472-8070  
(512) 472-0180 (facsimile)  
bbuffington@buffingtonlaw.com

**STATEMENT**

**RE: C14-05-0025 – 1706 & 1708 W. 6<sup>TH</sup> ST.  
CITY OF AUSTIN – PLANNING COMMISSION**

My name is Paul Seals. My wife and I are opposed to the proposed zoning change. We are the owners of 1709 Francis Avenue, a property that is affected adversely by the recommendation of the staff in this zoning case. We have lived there for the past 18 years. I am also a member of Old West Austin Neighborhood Association Steering Committee. This is my second tour of duty on the Steering Committee, having served in the late 90's. I was also a member of the Neighborhood Planning Team, with responsibility for the land use policies incorporated into the Neighborhood Plan that was approved in 2000.

This is not my first appearance before this Commission regarding 1706 West 6<sup>th</sup> Street. The previous owner, filed a zoning request in 1998, which was denied by the City Council. The rationale for the denial of both that 1998 case and an earlier case involving 1804 West 6<sup>th</sup> formed the basis for the specific language in the Neighborhood Plan, which is applicable to this case. Dave Sullivan, who was also a member of the Planning Team took the lead in crafting this language.

**The staff recommendation is contrary to the City Council instructions relating to this case.**

The fundamental question before you tonight should be: why in the world are we here considering this zoning request? I hope that you have reviewed the transcript from the City Council Meeting of September 26, 2002. It is clear that the Council directed the staff to initiate rezoning after being assured by the owners of 1706 West 6<sup>th</sup> that they were aware of and would comply with the limitations in the Neighborhood Plan. For two and half years, the staff has pondered this case. Instead of going back to the Council for reconsideration and further instructions, the staff has recommended approval of the rezoning in violation of the Neighborhood Plan. If there is a problem with the Plan, the appropriate procedure should be to consider revisions to the Plan instead of what you have before you which is a recommendation to disregard the Plan. This Commission should not be considering a recommendation from the staff that is not in conformance with the Neighborhood Plan.

**The land use provisions for the North 6<sup>th</sup> Street District are fundamental provision of Neighborhood Plan.**

The provisions are designed to accomplish one of the overarching goals of the Neighborhood Plan's Land Use Policies – preservation of the residential core of the neighborhood by protecting against erosion from the edges. The provisions for the North 6<sup>th</sup> Street District are designed to establish a defined barrier between commercial and residential properties. The Plan specifically prohibits alley access, which would impact residential properties. The staff proposal eviscerates the Neighborhood Plan.

The staff recommends that the rezoning include access through the existing narrow alley and a privately-owned driveway in clear violation of the Neighborhood Plan, which prohibits business

access through the alley and requires access through a street with minimum width of 36 feet. Although properties at either end of the 1700 Block of West 6<sup>th</sup> are zoned commercial, each rezoning required direct access off of either Augusta St or Patterson Ave both of which had to

**The staff recommendation is not enforceable.**

The staff has recommended site ingress off West 6<sup>th</sup> with egress through the alley. How will these restrictions be enforced, particularly in light of the on-going willful violations of existing zoning? There are no practical methods to enforce the restriction short of stationing a policeman in the alley or constructing one of those one-directional metal-barbed strips that you find at car rental locations.

**The staff recommendation results in the condemnation of residential property.**

Under Transportation on page 5 of the review sheet, the staff recommends that the currently existing pavement north of the dedicated alley should be dedicated as a public right-of-way. I assume this means that the City would condemn a portion of my property as well as at 1707 Francis to accommodate the rezoning. Please note the aerial photo in your back-up materials, which has been marked to show the dedicated alley. The alley dead-ends behind 1706 West 6<sup>th</sup> and my property. Previous residential owners paved a driveway across the southern portion of my property to connect to another alley to the west. The City proposes that access be through my property.

If the City wants to exercise this power of eminent domain, at least it should be done consistent with the Neighborhood Plan. The City could acquire a strip of land south and parallel to the existing alley to provide direct commercial access off of Augusta Street. This would not only be consistent with the Neighborhood Plan by providing for the construction of a barrier between the commercial and residential properties it would also correct fence that was constructed contrary to the City's approval of the rezoning of 1700-04 West 6<sup>th</sup> in the early 80's.

**The City should not reward willful violation of the existing zoning.**

Since 1997, shortly after the previous owner purchased the house from long-time residents and converted the house to an office, the residential neighbors have been complaining to the City about the illegal commercial use. Even after the rezoning was denied in 1998, the City did nothing in response to our complaints for the continued illegal use.

Shortly after the Leons acquired 1706 West 6<sup>th</sup> from the previous owner, I happened to meet them in the alley between our houses. I noticed their young child. I introduced myself and welcomed them to the neighborhood and started to praise our neighborhood elementary school. They looked at me with disbelief and told me that Sarah Leon was going to open her law office in the house and they had no intention of living there. I advised them of the residential zoning of the property and the past denial of the attempt at rezoning. With full knowledge of the zoning, Sarah Leon opened her office. We continued filing our complaints. The Leons continue their illegal use. What started out as one or two cars parked off the alley is now 6 to 8 cars double-

parked. Their backyard is now a parking lot. The parking has spilled over into the dedicated alley.

they ask the City to help them out. One of the fundamental principles of equity is clean hands. You do not seek equity unless you have clean hands. Neither this Commission nor the City should feel any compunction to grant the relief sought by the Leons.

As a resident of Austin, I find it unconscionable that the City staff appears to go to any length to force fit a rezoning to solve a problem of the Leon's own creation to the detriment of our neighborhood. That is surely not what the Council intended when they directed the staff to initiate this case.

Finally, I would ask you to consider what has been going on in our immediate neighborhood. In the past 5-10 years there has been a tremendous investment and growth in the owner-occupied residential properties along Francis, Patterson and Theresa. Because of the location, people want to live here. Just because the Leons were never interested in 1706 as a residence does not mean others would not be.

Our neighborhood is a real special place – something worth fighting for!!!

My family urges this Commission to reject the staff's recommendation to rezone these properties.

Paul Seals  
1709 Francis Ave.  
499.6203 (o)  
474.0904 (h)  
pseals@akingump.com

612-441-5212  
mreed4@aol.com

**Bolt, Thomas**

---

**From:** Kris Kasper [KKasper@abaustin.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 26, 2005 3:11 PM  
**To:** Bolt, Thomas  
**Subject:** FW: CCDC re rezoning

fyi

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Sara Leon [mailto:sleon@powell-leon.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 26, 2005 3:09 PM  
**To:** MReed4@aol.com  
**Subject:** FW: CCDC re rezoning

Thanks so much for checking on this! We'll keep you up to date on our progress.

Sara Leon

---

**From:** MReed4@aol.com [mailto:MReed4@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 26, 2005 2:58 PM  
**To:** sleon@powell-leon.com  
**Subject:** CCDC re rezoning

I was finally able to track down 5 CCDC board members (representing a quorum of our board) and all 5 have no problem with the rezoning given that the houses are on 6th Street and the businesses located in those houses will not generate a lot of traffic through the neighborhood. So, you can say that you have the support of the CCDC board.

Mary

Mary Reed  
MR-PR  
1101 Charlotte Street  
Austin, TX 78703  
512-441-5212  
mreed4@aol.com

## **Bolt, Thomas**

---

**From:** Jody Bickel [JBickel@abaustin.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 26, 2005 12:45 PM  
**To:** jmvcofrez@hotmail.com; ksource@hotmail.com; cldg@galindogroup.com; Riley, Chris; matt.pc@newurban.com; jay\_reddy@dell.com; Cynthia.medlin@sbcglobal.net; sully.jumpnet@sbcglobal.net; Bolt, Thomas  
**Cc:** Kris Kasper  
**Subject:** 1706 & 1708 W. 6th Street (C14-05-0025 - Agenda Item 5)

Kris Kasper asked me to forward this message to you all regarding tonight's Agenda Item 5.

Dear Commissioners:

I represent Sara Leon and Don Henry, as owners of the property located at 1706 and 1708 W. 6th Street, in the zoning case before you tonight (C14-05-0025 - Agenda Item 5). I wanted to provide you all with some history of this case.

Based on the character of 6th street, the numbers of office and retail properties up and down 6th street, and the heavy traffic associated with 6th street, most people agree that these two properties are no longer appropriate for residential use. Your backup packet should contain some support letters from adjacent property owners. Also, the Old West Austin Neighborhood Plan's future land use map recognizes that both of these properties should be changed to office use. In order to be re-zoned to office, though, the plan recommended that a CO be placed on the properties that would : (i) limit each property to 40 trips/day; (ii) prohibit business access through the alley; (iii) require business access from a street with a minimum width of 36' and (iv) install a 10' vegetative buffer or 6' high masonry fence to separate the business use from the adjacent residential properties.

Both Sara and Don became involved with the Old West Austin Neighborhood Plan at the end of the process. Both owners attended the City Council meeting in Sept. of 2002. At that time, City Council directed staff to initiate a zoning case on the properties to re-zone the property NO-MU-CO-NP. At that meeting, staff stated that "staff will look at the conditional overlays that will be addressed in the neighborhood plan, amending the neighborhood plan with conditions, and direct staff to bring that back at a later date." Essentially, staff agreed to revisit both the zoning and conditional overlay recommended for the properties.

In accordance with Council's request that the overlay and zoning be evaluated, staff has now reviewed and modified the recommendation originally proposed by the neighborhood plan. Staff now recommends the NO-MU-CO-NP zoning, but the overlay that is different from the neighborhood plan. This overlay recommends that: (i) combined trips for both properties be limited to 145/day; (ii) ingress to the property be from 6th Street with egress to the alley; and (iii) a 10' buffer or 6' masonry fence be installed, except where egress is located. The owners are happy to comply with staff's current recommendation, if that is the Commission's intent. The owners have been able to obtain a curb cut on to 6th Street. However, we recognize that a driveway entrance on 6th street is extremely dangerous in this location. At the bottom of this email, I have attached an email from Emily Barron, Sr. Planner with Transportation Review. Ms. Barron recognizes that staff's "initial preference was to have all of the access off of the alley," but to satisfy some neighbor concerns about traffic on the alley, staff modified its original recommendation. In accordance with staff's initial preference, the owners respectfully request that the overlay be revised so that all ingress and egress off of the alley be considered

for safety reasons.

Thank you for your time. Please feel free to call or email me with any questions.

Kris Kasper

Armbrust & Brown, L.L.P.  
100 Congress Ave., Suite 1300  
Austin, Texas 78701  
512-435-2325 (ph)  
512-435-2360 (fax)

-----Original Message-----

From: emily.barron@ci.austin.tx.us [mailto:emily.barron@ci.austin.tx.us]

Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2005 2:35 PM  
To: Kris Kasper  
Cc: Thomas.Bolt@ci.austin.tx.us  
Subject: Alley Access

Kris -

HI! To follow up on our conversation regarding access to the alley for 1706 and 1708 W 6th Street, there were many considerations when looking at access for this site. When considering the topography of the site, the traffic volumes on 6th Street and existing access to the buildings our initial preference was to have all of the access off of the alley. In order to take into account the neighborhood plans requests to have no access off the alley we came to the recommendation to allow a driveway cut to serve only as an entry point for the site off of 6th Street and allow vehicles to exit off of the alley. Please let me know if you have any other questions. Thanks!

~ Emily

Emily M. Barron  
Sr. Planner ~ Transportation Review  
City of Austin Watershed Protection & Development Review Department One  
Texas Center ~ 4th Floor P.O. Box 1088  
Austin, Texas 78767-1088  
Phone: (512) 974-2788 Fax: (512) 974-2423  
E-Mail: emily.barron@ci.austin.tx.us

Written comments must be submitted to the board or commission (or the contact person listed on the notice) before or at a public hearing. Your comments should include the board or commission's name, the scheduled date of the public hearing, and the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice.

Case Number: C14-05-0025  
Contact: Thomas Bolt, (512) 974-2755  
Public Hearing:  
April 26, 2005 Planning Commission

John and Lisa Tully  
Your Name (please print)



608 Patterson Ave 78703  
Your address(es) affected by this application

Lisa Tully  
Signature

4-25-05  
Date

Comments:  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

If you use this form to comment, it may be returned to:  
City of Austin  
Neighborhood Planning and Zoning Department  
Thomas Bolt  
P. O. Box 1088  
Austin, TX 78767-8810

Written comments must be submitted to the board contact person listed on the notice) before or at a public hearing. Your comments should include the board or commission's name, the scheduled date of the public hearing, and the Case Number listed on the notice.

Case Number: C14-05-0025  
Contact: Thomas Bolt, (512) 974-2755  
Public Hearing:  
April 26, 2005 Planning Commission

David Applewhite  
Your Name (please print)

608 Patterson Ave  
Your address(es) affected by this application

David Applewhite  
Signature

Comments:  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

If you use this form to comment, it may be returned to:  
City of Austin  
Neighborhood Planning and Zoning Department  
Thomas Bolt  
P. O. Box 1088  
Austin, TX 78767-8810

...ission (or the  
...ing. Your  
...the scheduled  
...ctact person



2-4-05  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## **MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Chris Riley, Chair and Members of the Planning Commission

**FROM:** Thomas Bolt, Senior Planner  
Neighborhood Planning and Zoning Department

**DATE:** July 20, 2005

**SUBJECT:** Planning Commission Summary

Attached is a Planning Commission summary, which will be forwarded to the City Council.

**CASE # C14-05-0025**

**Rezoning:** C14-05-0025 - 1706 & 1708 W. 6th St. - City Initiated  
**Location:** 1706 & 1708 W. 6th Street, Town Lake Watershed, Old West Austin NPA  
**Owner/Applicant:** 1706-Jeffrey & Sarah Leon 1708-Don Henry  
**Agent:** City of Austin  
**Request:** SF-3-NP to NO-MU-CO-NP  
**Staff Rec.:** RECOMMENDED  
**Staff:** Thomas Bolt, 974-2755, Thomas.bolt@ci.austin.tx.us  
Neighborhood Planning & Zoning Department

Tom Bolt presented the staff recommendation and explained that staff looked into the alley and on-street parking issues. In regards to parking on West 6<sup>th</sup> Street, Public Works did not recommend parallel parking on that street.

Commissioner Sullivan said that the speed limit along West 6<sup>th</sup> Street is 35mph and Mr. Bolt said that in reality it is much higher. Commissioner Sullivan said staff should consider the effect of on street parking on calming the speeds along that street. Emily Barron, the transportation reviewer, said she discussed the on-street parking issue with Public Works and they said the vertical curve and the higher speed are the reasons they did not recommend on-street parking. Commissioner Reddy asked if there is even space to have on-street parking and Ms. Barron said the way it is currently striped, no.

Commissioner Moore asked Commissioner Sullivan if he thought on-street parking would be in front of the house or along more parts of West 6<sup>th</sup> Street.

FOR

Richard Suttle, substituting for Chris Casper the representative for the case, said the house is in a commercial area. Commissioner Sullivan asked him if he had discussed the idea of on street parking with Public Works. Mr. Suttle said that he does not know if Chris Casper spoke with staff.

FOR, Did not speak  
Patty Alvey  
Don Henry  
Sara Leon  
Jeff Leon

AGAINST

Paul Seals, owner of the property immediately north of the subject properties, said that the committee and neighborhood have spent time on this case. At this point, the neighborhood is not in agreement with the zoning. Parking is being provided on-site on other sites. Traffic calming is important. Providing parking on West 6<sup>th</sup> Street would move in that direction of calming the traffic. The bottom line on the alley realignment is that there were conditions in the neighborhood plan for these properties. He told Sara

Leon that even if an agreement was reached, he said at some point the neighborhood plan would have to be amended.

Beverly Dunn, said she lives on Patterson Avenue and said she did meet with the neighbors and lawyers. The neighborhood agrees with the proposed egress and the on-street parking. She is concerned about the amount of parking for the clients though. There are cars parked illegally on the adjacent streets as a result of spillover from the businesses. Ignoring the details of the neighborhood plan means ignoring the thought and work put into working out conditions for the property.

Laura Morrison said she looked at the September 2002 Council transcript and said it was foreseen that it might stay residential. Only if the conditions in the neighborhood plan were incorporated would the plan go forward. The recent neighborhood-planning ordinance said that substantive changes to the text, not just changes to land use, require neighborhood plan amendments.

Against, Did not speak  
Thomas Dunn  
Rob Miller  
Thomas Barbour

**REBUTTAL:**

Mr. Suttle said that the requested zoning is in conformance with the adopted future land use map.

Commissioner Sullivan asked Mr. Suttle if he would support a rezoning that would prohibit access to the alley. The argument is how strict to make the conditional overlay.

Commissioner Riley asked Mr. Suttle about the Council transcript and how it clearly states that if the property is to be commercial, there should not be access to the alley. Mr. Suttle said that the conditions, such as limiting access to the alley, may not allow a reasonable use of the property.

**MOTION: CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING**  
**VOYE: 7-0 (JR-1st, DS-2<sup>nd</sup>; CG-ABSENT)**

Commissioner Reddy asked Ms. Leon about the nature of the business. Ms. Leon said that the employees are not present at the office all the time. They represent school districts throughout the state and so some travel and are not in the office.

Commissioner Medlin asked about the idea of a driveway to the parking adjacent to the site. Mr. Bolt said that was not considered because of the dangers of egress onto West 6<sup>th</sup> Street. Commissioner Medlin said that it seems it would be dangerous to have on-street parking. Mr. Bolt explained that staff did not recommend egress; they only recommend ingress only for the driveway. The visibility is a problem because the sites are 6 feet above the street. The access to the parking lot in the rear of the parking lot would be a

problem. Commissioner Medlin sought clarification that the neighborhood has rejected egress in the alley. Mr. Bolt said that the neighborhood plan does not recommend any access onto the alley.

Commissioner Medlin asked about the concerns that this request does not require a neighborhood plan amendment. She said it does not appear reasonable that the property cannot be used for commercial unless the restrictive conditions are met, and with those conditions wondered why a neighborhood plan amendment would not be needed. Mr. Bolt said the text in the plan are considered guidelines, and that to enact them requires Council action. Mr. Bolt read the plan statement that Council approval of the plan is not the implementation of the plan. Council action is required to implement the plan. Mr. Bolt said that the entire neighborhood planning staff and the Director discussed this issue and decided that the conditions are guidelines, and considered them in developing the conditional overlay recommendation.

**MOTION: APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATION, INCLUDING ALL CONDITIONS, BUT REQUIRE INGRESS AND EGRESS ONLY FROM THE ALLEY AND DIRECT STAFF TO PREPARE A PLAN TO ALLOW ON-STREET PARKING ON WEST 6<sup>TH</sup> STREET TO ADDRESS THE PARKING CONCERNS FOR SITE.**

**VOTE: (JR-1<sup>st</sup>, MM-2<sup>nd</sup>; CM-OPPOSED, CG- ABSENT)**

Commissioner Reddy said that the staff recommendation may not include the words of the plan but it meets the spirit of the plan.

Commissioner Moore said he supports having commercial on West 6<sup>th</sup> Street and he does not believe the neighborhood plan should lock in certain conditions that might need to change over time.

Commissioner Cortez asked if the staff recommendation specifies ingress only. Mr. Bolt said yes, as well as alley dedication and straightening out alley and egress to the alley. The subcommittee's recommendation did not include access to the alley.

Commissioner Cortez said that he does not want to see a curb cut on West 6<sup>th</sup> Street and the purpose of having an alley is to provide access.

Commissioner Moore asked for reasons why access would be restricted to the alley and Commissioner Cortez said that the purpose of an alley is to provide access and that there are no other curb cuts on that block.

Commissioner Sullivan said he has to contest assumption that the purpose of alley is to provide access because that alley was constructed for a single-family use that generates 20 trips a day, not 40 trips a day, as this use would. Commissioner Sullivan pointed out that the other properties on the block are next to other streets, so access is taken to the side streets, rather than to the parking lot.

Commissioner Sullivan offered that parking should be provided on West 6<sup>th</sup> Street, some on Augusta and some on the rear of the property. This would spread the commercial parking out, instead of having it all on the rear of the property, which the neighborhood does not want.

Commissioner Moore commented on the trips per day being too high. It seems it is based on suburban development.

Commissioner Medlin said that the issues of parking and traffic should have been dealt with at the time of neighborhood planning because it seems the conditions in the plan are unrealistic. She does not want to totally negate a valid conditional overlay simply because now it is recognized that the conditions in the plan are bad. However, she does not want to set a precedent of not considering conditions in a plan, and so would prefer that a neighborhood plan amendment be done.

Commissioner Riley said that he will support the motion. He said that the Council transcript makes it clear that people would expect at the time that this would still be in the works. He prefers access to the alleyway. He would encourage the neighborhood residents to revisit the neighborhood plan, for instance there have been design tools adopted since plan adopted.

Commissioner Sullivan stressed that he only supports the motion because the on-street parking provision was added to the motion.

**Bolt, Thomas**

---

**From:** Dave Sullivan [sully.jumpnet@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 03, 2005 9:33 PM  
**To:** Jody Bickel; Kris Kasper; Bolt, Thomas; cynthia.medlin@sbcglobal.net  
**Subject:** Re: 1706 & 1708 W. 6th Street (C14-05-0025)

Kris and Tom

I have been scouting these addresses over the past week. Here is what I think:

1. Regarding alley use, limit it to the same level of activity (parking spaces and trips per day) as would be generated in by typical residential development.
2. Have the owners pay the city to secure dedicated parking places on Augusta.
3. CoA to paint parallel parking spaces on W. 6th between Augusta and Patterson. Owners to pay the city to secure these as dedicated parking places.
4. Point out to neighbors the advantage of a.) having a little activity on the alley during the day to deter burglars and vandals, and b.) having no activity after hours and on weekend, providing peace and quiet that a crammed college-student house would not.

I am not sure what it takes to "rent" public parking spaces to a private business, but we allow valet parking folks to do it. Also, I recognize off-site parking may require a BoA variance, but if that's what it takes, so be it. If the access is permitted through the parking lot on Augusta instead of the alley, then drop above requirements and go with NO-CO (no alley access). If access is permitted through the parking lot on Patterson, then applicant must pay to construct a sidewalk on Patterson to offset the increased risk to pedestrians there. I believe the dollar value of the risk added by office traffic exceeds the dollar cost of the sidewalk construction.

Dave

At 12:44 PM 4/26/2005, you wrote:

>Kris Kasper asked me to forward this message to you all regarding  
>tonight's Agenda Item 5.

>

>Dear Commissioners:

>

>I represent Sara Leon and Don Henry, as owners of the property located  
>at 1706 and 1708 W. 6th Street, in the zoning case before you tonight  
>(C14-05-0025 - Agenda Item 5). I wanted to provide you all with some  
>history of this case.

>

>Based on the character of 6th street, the numbers of office and retail  
>properties up and down 6th street, and the heavy traffic associated with  
>6th street, most people agree that these two properties are no longer  
>appropriate for residential use. Your backup packet should contain some  
>support letters from adjacent property owners. Also, the Old West  
>Austin Neighborhood Plan's future land use map recognizes that both of  
>these properties should be changed to office use. In order to be  
>re-zoned to office, though, the plan recommended that a CO be placed on  
>the properties that would : (i) limit each property to 40 trips/day;  
>(ii) prohibit business access through the alley; (iii) require business  
>access from a street with a minimum width of 36'and (iv) install a 10'

>vegetative buffer or 6' high masonry fence to separate the business use  
>from the adjacent residential properties.

>  
>Both Sara and Don became involved with the Old West Austin Neighborhood  
>Plan at the end of the process. Both owners attended the City Council  
>meeting in Sept. of 2002. At that time, City Council directed staff to  
>initiate a zoning case on the properties to re-zone the property  
>NO-MU-CO-NP. At that meeting, staff stated that "staff will look at the  
>conditional overlays that will be addressed in the neighborhood plan,  
>amending the neighborhood plan with conditions, and direct staff to  
>bring that back at a later date." Essentially, staff agreed to revisit  
>both the zoning and conditional overlay recommended for the properties.

>  
>  
>In accordance with Council's request that the overlay and zoning be  
>evaluated, staff has now reviewed and modified the recommendation  
>originally proposed by the neighborhood plan. Staff now recommends the  
>NO-MU-CO-NP zoning, but the overlay that is different from the  
>neighborhood plan. This overlay recommends that: (i) combined trips for  
>both properties be limited to 145/day; (ii) ingress to the property be  
>from 6th Street with egress to the alley; and, (iii) a 10' buffer or 6'  
>masonry fence be installed, except where egress is located. The owners  
>are happy to comply with staff's current recommendation, if that is the  
>Commission's intent. The owners have been able to obtain a curb cut on  
>to 6th Street. However, we recognize that a driveway entrance on 6th  
>street is extremely dangerous in this location. At the bottom of this  
>email, I have attached an email from Emily Barron, Sr. Planner with  
>Transportation Review. Ms. Barron recognizes that staff's "initial  
>preference was to have all of the access off of the alley," but to  
>satisfy some neighbor concerns about traffic on the alley, staff  
>modified its original recommendation. In accordance with staff's  
>initial preference, the owners respectfully request that the overlay be  
>revised so that all ingress and egress off of the alley be considered  
>for safety reasons.

>  
>Thank you for your time. Please feel free to call or email me with any  
>questions.

>  
>Kris Kasper

>  
>Armbrust & Brown, L.L.P.  
>100 Congress Ave., Suite 1300  
>Austin, Texas 78701  
>512-435-2325 (ph)  
>512-435-2360 (fax)

>  
>  
>-----Original Message-----  
>From: emily.barron@ci.austin.tx.us [mailto:emily.barron@ci.austin.tx.us]

>  
>Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2005 2:35 PM  
>To: Kris Kasper  
>Cc: Thomas.Bolt@ci.austin.tx.us  
>Subject: Alley Access

>  
>  
>Kris ~

>  
>HI! To follow up on our conversation regarding access to the alley for  
>1706 and 1708 W 6th Street, there were many considerations when looking  
>at access for this site. When considering the topography of the site,  
>the traffic volumes on 6th Street and existing access to the buildings  
>our initial preference was to have all of the access off of the alley.  
>In order to take into account the neighborhood plans requests to have no  
>access off the alley we came to the recommendation to allow a driveway  
>cut to serve only as an entry point for the site off of 6th Street and  
>allow vehicles to exit off of the alley. Please let me know if you have

>any other questions. Thanks!

>

>~ Emily

>

>Emily M. Barron

>Sr. Planner ~ Transportation Review

>City of Austin Watershed Protection & Development Review Department One

>Texas Center ~ 4th Floor P.O. Box 1088

>Austin, Texas 78767-1088

>Phone: (512) 974-2788 Fax: (512) 974-2423

>E-Mail: emily.barron@ci.austin.tx.us

ORDINANCE NO. \_\_\_\_\_

1 AN ORDINANCE REZONING AND CHANGING THE ZONING MAP FOR THE  
2 PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1706 AND 1708 WEST 6<sup>TH</sup> STREET IN THE OLD  
3 WEST AUSTIN NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN AREA FROM FAMILY RESIDENCE-  
4 NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN (SF-3-NP) COMBINING DISTRICT TO  
5 NEIGHBORHOOD OFFICE-MIXED USE-CONDITIONAL OVERLAY-  
6 NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN (NO-MU-CO-NP) COMBINING DISTRICT.

7  
8 **BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:**

9  
10 **PART 1.** The zoning map established by Section 25-2-191 of the City Code is amended to  
11 change the base district from family residence-neighborhood plan (SF-3-NP) combining  
12 district to neighborhood office-mixed use-conditional overlay-neighborhood plan (NO-  
13 MU-CO-NP) combining district on the property described in Zoning Case No. C14-05-  
14 0025, on file at the Neighborhood Planning and Zoning Department, as follows:

15  
16 Lot 9, Block A (1706 W. 6<sup>th</sup>), Ecks Heights Subdivision, and Lot 1 (1708 W. 6<sup>th</sup>),  
17 West End Heights Subdivision, subdivisions in the City of Austin, Travis County,  
18 Texas, according to the map or plat of record, respectively, in Plat Book 3, Page  
19 16, and Plat Book 3, Page 20, of the Plat Records of Travis County, Texas (the  
20 "Property"),

21  
22 locally known as 1706 and 1708 West 6<sup>th</sup> Street, in the City of Austin, Travis County,  
23 Texas, and generally identified in the map attached as Exhibit "A".

24  
25 **PART 2.** Except as specifically provided in Part 3 and Part 4, the Property may be  
26 developed and used in accordance with the regulations established for the neighborhood  
27 office (NO) base district and other applicable requirements of the City Code.

28  
29 **PART 3.** The Property within the boundaries of the conditional overlay combining district  
30 established by this ordinance is subject to the following conditions:

- 31  
32 1. A site plan or building permit for the Property may not be approved, released, or  
33 issued, if the completed development or uses of the Property, considered cumulatively  
34 with all existing or previously authorized development and uses, generate traffic that  
35 exceeds 145 trips per day.  
36

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

2. Vehicular access from the Property to the adjacent alley along the north boundary is prohibited. All vehicular access shall be from other adjacent public streets or through other adjacent property.

**PART 4.** The Property is subject to Ordinance No. 020926-26 that established the Old West Austin neighborhood plan combining district.

**PART 5.** This ordinance takes effect on \_\_\_\_\_, 2005.

**PASSED AND APPROVED**

\_\_\_\_\_, 2005

§  
§  
§


Will Wynn  
Mayor


**APPROVED:** \_\_\_\_\_

David Allan Smith  
City Attorney

**ATTEST:** \_\_\_\_\_

Shirley A. Brown  
City Clerk





 1"=400'	<b>SUBJECT TRACT</b> 	<b>ZONING</b>  <b>CASE #: C14-05-0026</b> <b>ADDRESS: 1708-1708 W 6TH ST</b> <b>SUBJECT AREA (acres): N/A</b>	<b>DATE: 05-02</b>  <b>INTLS: 6M</b>	<b>CITY GRID REFERENCE NUMBER</b>  <b>H23</b>
	<b>PENDING CASE</b> 			
	<b>ZONING BOUNDARY</b> 			
	<b>CASE MGR: T. BOLT</b>			

#57



## MEMORANDUM

**To:** Mayor and Council

**From:** Alice Glasco, Director  
Neighborhood Planning and Zoning Department

**Date:** October 19, 2005

**Subject:** Item 57 1706-1708 W. Sixth Street C14-00-0025

On September 1, 2005 the City Council passed on 1<sup>st</sup> reading a rezoning of 1706-1708 W Sixth St. from SF-3-NP to NO-MU-NP with 8 conditions. Two of those conditions, limiting access to Sixth St. and a 145 vehicle trip per day limit will be a conditional overlay in the ordinance. Five of the conditions; a masonry fence, dumpster prohibition, submittal of a site plan, commencement of construction and a rollback provision will be in a private restrictive covenant. One of the conditions requested the staff to explore the possibility of permitting the property to be legal non-complying/non conforming. The staff requested that the applicant present a list of those code requirements from which they were seeking exemption. Exemptions to the site development regulations would include the following:

1. Article 7: Section 25-6-471, Section 25-6-472 and the Transportation Criteria Manual: No paving/technical design with the exception of paving the driveway entrance and drive aisle.
2. Chapter 25-7: Drainage: No on-site detention required.
3. Article 6: Section 25-8-211 and Section 25-8-214: No water quality controls required.
4. Article 10: Section 25-2-1051 and Section 25-2-1066 and The Environmental Criteria Manual Section 2: Landscaping/Buffering not required except the masonry wall as required by the Neighborhood Plan, as amended.
5. Building Criteria Manual: Section 1, Section 4 and Section 5: To require no utility upgrades to commercial standards
6. Article 2: Section 25-2-492: To exceed the overall impervious cover and building coverage under NO base zoning district (objective is current improvements and related parking/driveway are ok)
7. Uniform Building Code: To not comply with major ADA or TAS renovations:
  - a) Except for 20% of the total cost of the overall remodel
  - b) Those areas on the first floor utilized for customer service and waiting

Staff had a meeting with the applicant's agent and items 4-7 were withdrawn. Staff cannot support the exemptions from these requirements. Staff is also unaware of a legal means to make exemptions from these Code requirements through the zoning process.

#### **Item 1. Paved Parking**

Since at least 1973, the City Code has required that commercial parking lots be paved with a hard surfacing material sufficient to prevent mud, dust, loose material, and other nuisances. The use of gravel or similar materials is not generally permitted because:

- Gravel cannot be striped; consequently, there is no way to delineate parking spaces.
- For drainage purposes, gravel is not considered pervious when used in parking lots because it eventually becomes compacted.
- Gravel is not an effective filtration device for water quality purposes unless it is periodically removed and replaced.
- Gravel may be a hazard for pedestrians and does not meet requirements for handicapped accessibility.
- Gravel can be carried into city streets and drainageways by automobiles or stormwater. Loose gravel on asphalt streets can be imbedded into the surface by vehicles, leading to pavement deterioration and potholes.
- Gravel produces dust in dry weather, and mud or standing water in wet weather.

Section 25-6-472 (H) of the Land Development Code requires parking areas comply with the Transportation Criteria Manual. There is not a variance procedure for this section of the Code. The Transportation Criteria Manual does allow the Director to approve crushed stone for parking in order to protect trees. In such cases the stone must be limited to the critical root zone of the trees and must be confined by curbing or other barriers to keep it in place. Crushed stone is not allowed on slopes, within handicapped parking spaces, or along accessible routes between parking and the building entry.

Staff recommends that Council not waive the requirement for paved parking but rather allow the applicant to pursue the use of an alternative surface based on the criteria in the Transportation Criteria Manual. If Council does choose to waive the requirement, however, the waiver should not apply to handicapped-accessible parking.

Based upon the floor area of the buildings on this site, the owner would be required to provide 12 regular spaces and 1 accessible space, which will require about 4000 square feet of paving, in addition to the driveway to W. 6th St.. It is unclear whether the applicant is asking for a waiver from the parking requirement or only the paving requirement. A variance from the parking requirement can only be granted by the Board of Adjustment unless a special ordinance is adopted for this property by City Council.

In addition, the City Council may not waive land use regulations contained in Chapter 25 of the Land Development Code because such waivers constitute amendments to Chapter 25. The City Charter requires that all amendments to Chapter 25 be reviewed by the Planning Commission prior to consideration by the City Council.

**Item 2. Chapter 25-7 Drainage:**

Impacts from new impervious cover will increase the run-off for the two, ten, twenty-five and one hundred year storm events. Code requires on site detention for such development. Though the impact may be small for small amounts of impervious cover, it is the cumulative effect of many such projects that can be detrimental to our watersheds. However, if the applicant can demonstrate that a development's increase in run-off does not seriously impact any existing infrastructure then the applicant would be eligible to apply for a wavier to on-site detention. This process is in place in order to control, and offer relief from Code requirements, for just this type of project.

**Item 3. Article 6: Section 25-8-211 and Section 25-8-214 Water Quality**

On-site controls are required for cumulative increases of 5000 sq. ft or more, over base impervious cover, in the Urban watersheds. With certain developments, the applicant may be granted participation in "payment in lieu" of onsite water quality controls. This program allows difficult to treat, low impact developments to forego onsite treatment and compensate by contributing funds towards regional controls developed by the City. These mechanisms are in place to offer relief from Code for this type of development. Not requiring compliance would leave the regional program short funded.



Alice Glasco, Director  
Neighborhood Planning and Zoning Department

jr

cc: Laura Huffman, ACM  
Shirley Brown, City Clerk